

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Hugh T. Stevenson, of the Bethany Baptist Church of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we draw near to Thee at this hour because Thou has been with our fathers in every crisis of our history. We thank Thee for the help, aid, and assistance that Thou hast given them in those trials. Help us to realize our need of Thee in this hour that is testing the very souls of men. Guide us and lead us so that we may learn from our errors, correct our mistakes, follow Thy light, and do Thy will. We ask Thy blessing to rest upon our country and upon all who are in authority. Fill us with peace, prosperity, and power. May we as a people honor Thee by doing Thy will and glorifying Thy name at all times and in all ways. We ask it in the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

S. 1335. An act to remove the limitation upon the filling of vacancy of district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Also a further message by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announcing that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6477) entitled "An act to further extend naturalization privileges to alien veterans of the World War residing in the United States."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1335. An act to remove the limitation upon the filling of vacancy of district judge for the district of New Jersey; and

S. 2498. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over public land in the District of Columbia.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11897, the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the pending amendment read for the information of the House?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDUFFIE: Page 71, line 4, strike out the paragraph ending in line 20.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carried in this War Department appropriation bill during the past several years for the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, and trails in the Territory of Alaska has been \$800,000 a year. This year the Bureau of the Budget reduced that appropriation to \$656,000 for the next fiscal year. This War Department subcommittee has further reduced that amount to \$354,310 for the coming fiscal year, and the amendment now under consideration, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], is to strike out that entire amount and leave no appropriation whatever for any work

of that kind throughout the entire Territory of Alaska for the next fiscal year.

I most earnestly ask the House to carefully consider the very serious and in fact disastrous effect of this amendment. There are at the present time about 1,750 miles of wagon roads in the Territory, and about 1,400 miles of dogsled roads, and approximately 7,300 miles of trails, besides some 700 miles of what are called flagged trails. The actual annual maintenance of those roads and trails, without any substantial extensions or improvements, costs about \$600,000 a year; and there is a very great need throughout Alaska for many more roads and trails for the proper development of that Territory.

Everyone who has ever visited Alaska knows that roads and trails are absolutely necessary for the purpose of any and practically all development in the Territory. The climatic conditions and the topography and character of the country make it imperatively necessary to constantly keep these roads and trails in repair. The deep snows and the spring and summer floods and torrential rains make road construction and road repair—and especially road maintenance—enormously expensive.

I speak from personal observation and knowledge of the conditions in Alaska. The Interior Department Appropriation Subcommittee, of which I have had the honor to be the present chairman and a member for many years, has twice visited Alaska. Last August, Mr. MURPHY, of Ohio, and Mr. HASTINGS, of Oklahoma, and I, as three members of that committee, made quite a careful study of the needs of the Territory in all respects. We were accompanied by the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, Mr. LEAVITT, of Montana, and the chairman of the Public Lands Committee, Mr. COLTON, of Utah, and others. And I am confident that every one of those gentlemen will substantiate what I say. We went from Seward to Fairbanks on the railroad. We stopped on the way and visited the Mount McKinley National Park. We returned from Fairbanks over the Richardson Highway from Fairbanks, nearly 400 miles to Valdez. That is not only the most wonderful highway in Alaska but it is one of the marvelous highways of the world. I can not take time to describe it or give its tremendous importance to the development of that Territory, but I will say that the Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska and the Army engineers and their assistants have done a wonderful work in the construction of that road, as well as in the maintenance of it. It is practically impossible to construct any road of any length in Alaska that will not require constant repair. No amount of skill can entirely guard against the deep snows, the melting glaciers, and the terrific floods. Bridges and large portions of this and all other roads are washed out at some time. We were compelled to have our automobiles pulled through several rivers by caterpillar tractors.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman inform the committee how much money the Federal Government has already expended in building roads and trails, bridges, and in highway construction in the Territory of Alaska to date?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The total amount expended for that purpose from 1905 to June 30, 1931, was \$17,273,794.62. Of that amount Alaska has contributed \$3,769,418.62, and there have been some contributions from other funds and sources.

There are five Army officers connected with the work of the Alaska Road Commission who receive a total of \$21,020.92 for salaries and allowances.

The Richardson Highway original construction cost \$2,732,000, and the maintenance and improvement of it to June 30, 1931, was \$3,820,000, making a total cost to that date of \$6,552,000, of which amount Alaska contributed about \$2,600,000.

I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that from the time our country purchased Alaska from Russia for \$7,200,000 on March 30, 1867, to December 31, 1931, our Gov-

ernment has spent all told \$200,117,286.92 in Alaska, and our country has received in return from Alaska \$50,357,660.65 in the form of money going into our Federal Treasury. Aside from that, Alaska has produced principally in fish, minerals, and furs about two and one-half billion dollars that has been taken out of that Territory by citizens of our country and brought into the United States. Besides that, the citizens of Alaska have purchased merchandise from our country to the amount of \$889,232,561. It is one of the richest possessions that any nation in the world has ever had. Its white population of about 28,000 are courageous, pioneer, red-blooded, loyal, and splendid American citizens, who are, against frightful obstacles, doing their level best to develop and make homes in that marvelously rich and wonderful Territory of our Government.

They richly deserve all the encouragement and support that Congress can ever give them. Alaska has no public debt and the lowest tax rates of any place under the American flag. For 50 years it has produced more gold every year than we paid Russia for the entire Territory that is one-fifth as large as the entire United States. It is often said that it is "conservation to death"; that is, it has more government per capita, less liberty, and more harmful congressional limitations upon its material development than any other place under our flag. There are about 15,000 Indians and about the same number of Eskimos scattered throughout that vast region. I wish you could all visit Alaska some time.

To anyone who knows anything about the climate and roads and conditions in the Territory it is absolutely cruel and unspeakably outrageous to refuse for even a year to make any appropriations for the maintenance of the roads and trails throughout that region. Alaska can not possibly be developed without roads and trails. In fact the people could not exist there without them. People must be able to travel about the country, especially by dog teams, about eight months in every year. Our country is in great need of the production of more gold. Mines can not operate unless they are accessible. The Government must open and improve and maintain the roads very largely, although it is true that Alaska contributes about 30 per cent toward all the road and trail construction. And when you consider the very limited resources of those people you must admit they are doing mighty well when they do that much.

Our Federal-aid road 50-50 law does not apply to Alaska at all. For that reason we have never made road appropriations up there in the way we have made fabulous appropriations for the much more wealthy States of our Union. Our Nation has a vast and enormous stake in Alaska. We can not afford to let it deteriorate, and we certainly can not afford to discourage or dishearten those people who all came from our States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls attention to the fact that before the committee rose on Tuesday a motion prevailed that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto should close in five minutes. Under those circumstances the debate on this paragraph is closed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion was made and debated.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. Is it not a fact that when we were in the Mount McKinley National Park last summer we saw a road in process of construction which was to extend to the gold fields, west of the park, which promised great additions to our gold supply?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts was with us and his statement is correct. We who were there all know it would be absolutely suicidal on our part to cut out this appropriation for road construction and road repair and upkeep in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. If I remember correctly the statement was made on the floor the other day that Alaska does not contribute anything to road building. There are two funds in Alaska which go into road building. One is known as the Alaska fund, which comes from certain business licenses, and the other is an annual or biennial appropriation made by the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true, and our Government contributes but 70 per cent.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I want it perfectly plain that Alaska's contribution is about \$50,000,000 annually. The gentleman did not make that clear.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not that amount annually, but all told.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is about \$2,500,000,000 all told, but \$50,000,000 annually.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I said Alaska has since we purchased the Territory in 1867 produced about \$2,500,000,000 in wealth. That is what the gentleman means.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; from Alaska.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I was talking about cash while the gentleman was talking about the output of fish, minerals, furs, and everything else that has been taken out of Alaska. I am talking about the money that went into the Federal Treasury from Alaska. That sum since 1867 has been about \$50,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it not true that if this appropriation should be stricken from the bill it would result in false economy, because the roads deteriorate very fast?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It would mean almost an utter destruction of all we have expended on roads and trails in Alaska. If those roads are allowed to go without maintenance for one year, it would mean that we would practically have to start all over again. Gentlemen, Congress absolutely must continue this road and trail work in that Territory. If we do not, our country will suffer an enormous loss and we will be most wrongfully and cruelly inflicting an irreparable injury and loss upon 28,000 as splendid people as there are anywhere on this globe. [Applause.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to do an injustice to any of our territorial possessions, certainly none to Alaska. I repeat what I said last Tuesday. I think we owe a special duty to the natives of Alaska, and probably it is more serious than the duty we owe to our own American citizens there, in view of the fact that they are our wards.

I recognize that we have brought from Alaska goods amounting in value to vast sums, but let us not forget that the bringing in of goods, so far as the amount is concerned, has receded as the years have passed. Let us not forget that we have already expended hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in the Territory of Alaska. Let us not forget that there are only 25,000 white people there and all told, counting our Eskimo population, less than 60,000 people in the Territory of Alaska. Let us not forget that if what the gentleman from California says is true, and if what the gentleman from Colorado says is true, there will be enough funds provided by the Territory itself to do all of the maintenance work on all the necessary roads and trails in Alaska.

The idea of maintaining 3,100 miles of highways in Alaska for the use of less than 60,000 people is perfectly preposterous to me.

We have a railroad in Alaska, built, if you please, to tap the coal fields of Alaska, and I am reliably informed that

they have to go to Canada to buy coal with which to run that railroad.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. They have now gotten to the point where they can use some of the coal of the Alaskan mines, and they are using it on this railroad.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I appreciate the interest gentlemen show in Alaska. The gentleman from Washington is a neighbor of Alaska; the gentleman from Colorado is interested in the Interior Department appropriation bill, and it is but natural for them to be interested. They have been there; they have been on the ground; but I have not. I am not an expert on Alaska, but I make the statement—which I do not think can be successfully contradicted—that if the Territory of Alaska is contributing anything at all to the funds for roads in Alaska those funds will be ample to take care of the maintenance of the roads, trails, and bridges in Alaska for the fiscal year of 1933.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] said the other day—and he was there also—that he saw a beautiful boulevard built in a forest, if you please, and that a vast sum of money had been expended for a wonderful bridge over a stream. That boulevard started in the forest and ended in the forest, and was paid for, if you please, largely by the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

It is true we have brought much goods from Alaska, but we are not continuing at the great rate of former years. Compared with the States of the Union, certainly, no man will say that the returns to the Public Treasury, according to the figures quoted by some gentlemen here and according to the figures placed in the Record by the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, are at all comparable. We are spending several million dollars more a year annually upon the Alaskan Territory from the Public Treasury than the receipts to the Treasury from the Territory.

I submit to you that at a time like this, when we are trying to effect economy in government, no individual in Alaska will be hurt by striking out this little appropriation. No loss will occur to the people of Alaska if we strike this item out, and I submit again that it should be stricken from this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDUFFIE) there were—ayes 50, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 661); and for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, \$59,277,095: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation expended under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles or launches, speed boats, or other similar small motor-propelled boats unless there shall be a specific appropriation therefor.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the proviso beginning on page 72, line 17, and ending with the word "therefor," in line 22.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Page 72, line 17, strike out the proviso beginning in line 17 and ending in line 22.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume there was some real purpose to correct an abuse when the gentleman's committee sought to ban the purchase of launches, speedboats, and other motor-propelled boats for the use of the engineers of the Army.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is exactly right, as he generally is—

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for that nice verbal bouquet.

Mr. COLLINS. We found that in a number of instances river and harbor funds had been used to purchase expensive speedboats—speedboats entirely out of proportion in size and cost to the necessities of the occasion—with the result that we thought we should require those in charge of the expenditure of these appropriations to furnish the Congress estimates of proposed expenditures for speedboats and small motor-propelled boats and similar craft, the same as they are required to do as to passenger-carrying vehicles; but we understand now that this provision, in view of the nearness of the commencement of the next fiscal year, might prevent the engineers from buying any boats, however necessary they might be, because it will be impracticable for them to furnish estimates as to their needs in time for inclusion in this bill. In addition to this General Brown has assured the committee that during the next fiscal year no boats will be bought except those that are absolutely essential and requisitions for which have come under his very close scrutiny.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought there was such a superfluity of motor boats in connection with the work of the Corps of Engineers that for one year at least there might be a respite in the purchase of these expensive boats.

Mr. COLLINS. Ordinarily I think the amendment should be carried, but I doubt very much the advisability of carrying it in the bill so late in the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. My own idea was that it should not be carried forever and ever, but there might be a respite just for one year, to let them dispose of some boats, where they have an excess number of them, and place a ban on the purchase of new boats for the time being. It was my opinion this provision would not do any violent injury to the service.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not think there will be any abuse next year, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 72, line 16, after the word "law," strike out "\$59,277,095" and insert "\$53,277,095."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to cut from the rivers and harbors appropriation the sum of \$6,000,000, or approximately 10 per cent of the total appropriation. This appropriation is divided, in the estimates that were furnished the committee, on the basis of approximately \$37,000,000 for new construction and approximately \$22,000,000 for maintenance.

I appreciate there are a large number of Members in this House who believe that the work they expected last summer they were going to get will be affected by this amendment and, perhaps, their vote will be influenced on this account; but let me call their attention to the facts that now exist. You know and I know that all contracts for public improvements are being let now on a basis at least 20 to 25 per cent below the letting figures of the 1st of last July and the 1st of last August, when these estimates were made up.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will not, because I have not the time.

You know and I know that with the money that will be carried in the bill after this 10 per cent cut there is no question in the world but what just as much in results can be had and just as much work can be accomplished as the Chief of Engineers figured would be accomplished when these figures were put together and \$75,000,000 was sent by

the Chief of Engineers to the Bureau of the Budget the 1st of last August or the 1st of last September.

Having in mind the reduction in material prices, and having in mind the reduction in labor prices, the Bureau of the Budget cut these figures from \$75,000,000 to \$60,000,000, and the committee cut them about \$700,000. Now, if you cut 10 per cent more and reduce it to about \$54,000,000, you will still leave enough, in my opinion, to let them do everything they planned to do when they first made the figures up.

A lot is said about the number of workmen to be affected by this sort of thing. With all the work that is going on, and all that is carried in the bills that have so far gone through Congress, the new construction work will provide employment with the \$175,000,000 or \$200,000,000 for something like 100,000 men.

It is far more intelligent for us to proceed on the basis to set industry to work, as the result of balancing the Budget, than it is to appropriate a paltry sum to provide relief for unemployment. Let us get to the bottom of the situation and the root of the trouble. We have been going along on a false basis of employment of people by the expenditure of public funds, for things and projects that were not absolutely needed, and which we could get along without. We have got to get to the point where we can balance the Budget and stop this sort of thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TABER was given two minutes more.)

Mr. TABER. If we do not balance the Budget and cut out these things that ought to be cut out and ought to be trimmed down, providing we are taking care of those projects which are absolutely necessary in a reasonable way, we are going to get to the point where we will have to cut everything of that kind out entirely.

Why not put our house in order on an intelligent basis, balance the Budget, and cut out enough to help toward putting the country to work? I appeal to the membership of the House to support this amendment and save to the people of the country this amount of money that will be saved as a result of the decreased cost of material and labor that has come along in the last 8 or 10 months. [Applause.]

It costs about \$4,900 to put a man to work in rivers and harbors work—the largest amount required in any branch of construction work in the Government. It costs about \$2,500 in the building-construction projects in our own districts.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this amendment, for this reason: First of all, the original budget that was agreed to by the engineers amounted to \$75,000,000. On account of existing conditions it was reduced to \$60,000,000. It has been cut as low as you can cut it, unless you want to destroy it.

My judgment is that if you take off this 10 per cent you will lose three times as much as if you left it on. The engineers are prepared over the country to follow the line in accordance with the surveys they have made.

They have the material on the ground and the men; they have the organization. In other words, when the money runs out the organization would have to disperse, the machinery be removed, and laid aside work until we could pass another appropriation.

This is a piece of folly, to talk about cutting an appropriation that will do so much damage to the country at the present time.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. Is it not a fact that in projects partly finished if you let them go for a year you would lose more than you would save by this amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes; if you let them lie for a year or two you would lose more than you would save.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not a fact that last year we spent \$83,000,000 of it and already labor is going to be laid off to the extent of \$23,000,000? This appropriation took the biggest cut of any appropriation. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] pointed out, the majority of this is in labor, either at the river, in the quarry, or in some other place, and if we take \$6,000,000 more off on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], it will result in cutting the wages of labor at those points.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Three hundred and fifty thousand labor days.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The real truth of the matter is that 90 per cent of the work is labor. We are talking now about appropriating a couple of billion dollars for the purpose of helping labor. I talked with General Brown just the other day. Four hundred and thirty-one million dollars worth of river and harbor work in this country has been allocated, and if you are going to appropriate money to help labor, that is where it should be used. Ninety per cent of the work is labor. If you are going to do something to help labor, where can you do it better than by going on with this \$431,000,000 of projects instead of taking off a measly little \$6,000,000?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is right in his statement that we can get work done for 20 per cent less than we could formerly, is not this the time to take advantage of that very fact?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Exactly so; and we must recognize the fact that we have the best organization in the Engineers' Department that we have ever had. The greatest care is being taken, the greatest effort at reducing expenses is being made, and I say to you that to deliberately step out here and cut this off would be a crime, and I hope nobody will follow the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman discuss briefly the amount of this appropriation that must be allocated to maintenance?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The gentleman from New York did that—\$22,000,000 for maintenance, which would give you about \$37,000,000 for new work. Think of it. With all of these men who are at work, even taking the gentleman's own figures, you will have to lay them off, and that is all there is to it. There is no sense in the proposition. I am just as much for economy as the gentleman from New York is. I want to balance the Budget just as much as he does, but the real truth of the matter is that this river and harbor work brings something to the Government; you get something for the money that you put out. You are not simply exploiting something; you are putting the money into these projects to bring about better facilities for transportation in the country.

I shall close this talk with just one statement. All of us on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, every member, have worked hard to do what? To bring to the attention of the House only projects that would be essential to the Government. On our committee we do not recommend worthless projects. We look into them, and this amount of money must not be lowered. If it is, you will destroy many of these projects that have been approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. McDUFFIE to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 72, line 16, strike out "\$59,277,095" and insert "\$55,313,240.25."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, of course, we might have and should have responded to the wishes of the people

of America and effected some economies in this bill with the military activities. If some of these gentlemen who are so solicitous of the Treasury this morning had been half so solicitous a few days ago, or when our economy program was before them, we might have saved in this bill \$24,000,000, which Mr. Hoover is alleged to have said to one or probably two of his spokesmen he would like to have saved in this bill. I would like to see some savings made in this bill.

There is no one on the floor of the House who is more interested in the development of our rivers and harbors work than I am. I have spent some 10 or 12 years studying such problems. I think it is a very important work of the Government and entirely necessary. I recall, however, that during the war our Government stopped the construction of new projects unless they were in the nature of emergencies, though we continued to maintain all projects.

While we are not at war with a foreign enemy, we are at war with economic conditions in this country that are far more serious than they were when we were in actual warfare. A 10 per cent cut is suggested. I shall be glad to insert in the Record the effect of that, as stated by General Brown, whom I regard as one of the truly great men of this Nation, together with his letter in which he said that a 10 per cent cut under \$60,000,000 will delay to some extent work on projects already adopted, and on new projects, excepting those that are highly essential in the development of the Nation's commerce. I do not think this House is going to cut the amount suggested by the committee by 10 per cent. I have submitted an amendment of 5 per cent for the consideration of the House in lieu of the 10.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Does the gentleman not think that on account of the war and the delay in taking care of these projects we find one of the reasons why we have to make these appropriations now? It was delayed so long that now we are up against it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am not so sure as to that. We have made very good progress in the development of our rivers and harbors. I am sure there are very worthy and essential projects that need development as quickly as possible in keeping with the condition of the Nation's finances. Such work will undoubtedly proceed. Of course, those of us who have studied this work of the Government regret to see the funds decreased, but, gentlemen, these are strenuous days; unhappy days of economic distress. Many activities of the Government must be curtailed, and at a time like this some should be eliminated. We will not, of course, eliminate river and harbor work; but I can not but feel that we are forced to make as much cut as possible on this or any other appropriation item without seriously impairing efficiency and creating lost motion and waste.

As to the employment feature involved, General Brown stated that he figured every \$1,500 might be measured by the labor of one employee in this work. If we take those figures, we find that we are not decreasing employment very much by the substitute amendment. I submit if you care to make reductions on this item, if you think it is wise policy, the 5 per cent reduction, in my judgment, will place you on safe ground and certainly prevent serious injury to probably one of the most important public works of the Government. The most important projects will be given attention, though a little less money will be expended on them under a 5 per cent cut.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that General Brown's original estimate of \$75,000,000 has already been cut \$15,000,000 by the Budget?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Fifteen million dollars. That is doubtless true.

Mr. CULKIN. And is it not a fact that that is the greatest cut that has been made in any appropriation bill in the House?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I do not know whether it is or not. I know it was suggested in the Economy Committee—and I am almost afraid to mention that committee now—that it could be cut \$20,000,000. I did not make the suggestion, but it was made, and I think it came originally from certain gentlemen, speaking the view of those connected with the administration, who thought such a cut was possible without injury. I think \$20,000,000 reduction is too much. I do think General Brown's letter can be construed to mean that he could carry on the most essential construction in this work with a further reduction of 5 per cent. I am frank to say I doubt the wisdom of a 10 per cent reduction of this item. I believe General Brown will make this fund go as far as possible with the best results to the taxpayers.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman understands that this item in this bill represents something over \$22,000,000 for maintenance?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. And represents work on 300 projects scattered north, south, east, and west?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Well, as for that matter, it means a cut on projects in my own district. Ten per cent would mean a cut of practically one-half million dollars within my immediate territory. This should at least show my good faith in offering an amendment to cut this item. Economy means cuts everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand from the Board of Engineers that with \$37,000,000 they will be able to employ 8,000 men, or practically \$4,900 per man.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I thought the gentleman had a question to ask, but am glad to have his figures. I made no inquiry of the board. I discussed this subject with the Chief of Engineers.

I am the last man on this floor to hinder or impede this very important activity. I am sincere when I say I believe that every essential project, those on the Missouri River, the Illinois, the Great Lakes, the Tennessee, Lake Okeechobee in Florida, and others, while taking a cut—I believe a 5 per cent cut—is not such a reduction as would destroy or greatly impede the activity, nor result in lost motion.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Does the gentleman think it is good economy to stop work that is already being done?

Mr. McDUFFIE. This will not stop work that is already being done; that is, the essential work that is already being done; the work that is absolutely necessary to carry on.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. On what authority does the gentleman say that?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Just the same authority that the gentleman stands on this floor and gives his own authority. I have studied this problem quite as long as the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Not any more than I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert the letter from General Brown, setting out what the situation will be, in his judgment, in the event of a 10 per cent cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDUFFIE. You will note that General Brown's estimate and suggestions are based on a 10 per cent cut,

while I am offering only a 5 per cent cut, leaving \$56,313,000 in round numbers for the work for 1933. I feel sure this committee will not accept a 10 per cent cut, and possibly you will make no cut at all, yet I feel this is a plan where we can save two or three million without serious injury.

The letter and figures of General Brown follow:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 6, 1932.

Hon. JOHN McDUFFIE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McDUFFIE: In accordance with your request I have carefully gone over the work planned by this department during the fiscal year 1933, with a view to determining the projects that would be affected by a reduction in the appropriation for river and harbor works from \$60,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

The Budget estimate of \$60,000,000 was attained by the elimination of all work on projects authorized by Congress but not yet begun, except certain projects of especial importance to commerce and navigation on which operations have not been undertaken because of the delay in meeting conditions of local co-operation, in the furnishing of lands, etc., the fulfillment of which is to be anticipated. A further reduction will entail the postponement of all work except that of the highest importance for commerce and navigation, for most of which continuing contracts have been or are being entered into. I inclose a list showing the reductions necessary in the allocations presented to the Subcommittee on Appropriations which would be necessary if the appropriation were reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

Sincerely yours,

LYTLE BROWN,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

(One inclosure.)

Reduction of allocations consequent upon a reduction in fiscal year 1933 appropriation for rivers and harbors from \$60,000,000 to \$50,000,000

	Budget	As reduced	Saving
New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbor, Mass.	\$60,000	0	\$60,000
Fall River Harbor, Mass.	88,000	0	88,000
Taunton River, Mass.	150,000	0	150,000
New London Harbor, Conn.	50,000	0	50,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	80,000	0	80,000
East Rockaway (Debs) Inlet, N. Y.	150,000	0	150,000
East River, N. Y.	1,034,000	\$500,000	534,000
Newtown Creek, N. Y.	102,300	0	102,300
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.	200,000	0	200,000
Delaware River, between Philadelphia and Trenton	100,000	0	100,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea	500,000	0	500,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	625,000	0	625,000
James River, Va.	150,000	0	150,000
Alabama River, Ala.	70,000	0	70,000
Caloosahatchee River-Lake Okeechobee drainage area	2,133,000	1,800,000	333,000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	80,000	0	80,000
Gulfport Harbor and Ship Island Pass, Miss.	60,000	0	60,000
San Francisco Harbor, Calif.	425,000	375,000	50,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif.	152,500	0	152,500
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.	37,000	0	37,000
Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii	400,000	300,000	100,000
Waterway, Cape Fear River-Winyah Bay, S. C.	500,000	0	500,000
Waterway, Jacksonville-Miami, Fla.	300,000	0	300,000
Pensacola Bay, Fla., to Mobile Bay, Ala.	265,000	0	265,000
Mobile Bay to New Orleans, La.	10,000	0	10,000
Louisiana-Texas intracoastal waterway: New Orleans-Sabine River	1,682,000	1,553,000	129,000
Sabine River-Corpus Christi	772,000	600,000	172,000
Mississippi River, between Ohio and Illinois Rivers	1,700,000	1,000,000	700,000
Mississippi River, between Illinois River and Minneapolis	3,700,000	3,000,000	700,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	4,400,000	3,695,800	704,200
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City	500,000	0	500,000
Ohio River, open channel work	900,000	500,000	400,000
Monongahela River, Pa., and W. Va.	700,000	410,000	290,000
Allegheny River, Pa., locks and dams	25,000	0	25,000
St. Marys River, Mich.	1,437,000	1,000,000	437,000
St. Clair River, Mich.	405,000	19,000	387,000
Holland Harbor, Mich.	40,000	0	40,000
Indiana Harbor, Ind.	120,000	0	120,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio	10,000	0	10,000
Fairport Harbor, Ohio	475,000	336,000	139,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	900,000	400,000	500,000
Total	25,488,800	15,488,800	10,000,000

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I have devoted many, many weeks of arduous labor during the present session in trying to bring about a reduction in Government expenditures and a decrease in appropriation bills; but I do not believe this is the place in this bill to make a cut. There are other cuts which can be made and to which I will direct attention presently.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether this Congress realizes the condition which confronts this country. I doubt whether we appreciate the gravity of it. Hunger, want, and unemployment prevail everywhere. Here is an amendment which proposes to cut the number of people employed. We have heard about a dole, and we hear about relief measures pending in the Senate and in the House, and it is said that before we adjourn this Congress we must do something to relieve these suffering people. I would infinitely more prefer to appropriate money here and let those people exchange labor and material for money, rather than give them a dole, a gratuity. That is what this amendment would do.

I said there were other cuts which could be made in this bill; and when we get back in the House, I hope they will be made. I refer to the citizens' military and Officers' Reserve Corps summer training camps. Under the bill as reported the citizens' military camps would be suspended one year and the Officers' Reserve Corps would be permitted to have the summer camp with all expenses paid but would draw no salary while there. These provisions as to the camps would apply for one year only.

Now, we did not go at this matter in a haphazard way in the preparation of this bill. We did not make these cuts arbitrarily. I shall tell you something that was said to me during the preparation of this bill. There was a high-up Army officer called to see me. He was not a dissatisfied officer. He was not one who had a grudge against the General Staff, but he was full-fledged. In other words, he was "in the swim," and he sought to elicit information from me as to what we might do in the preparation and reporting of this bill. I said, "We want to effect some economies if possible." He said, "Now, if you want to know where some real economies can be made that will not affect or impair the efficiency of national defense in the United States, I would be glad to inform you secretly where they could be made."

I said: "You are the man I am looking for."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman did not ask that high Army officer to appear before the subcommittee and give the entire subcommittee and the membership of the House the benefit of that information by printing his statement in the hearings. Why did he not give it openly rather than secretly?

Mr. WRIGHT. I gave it to the committee.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is not in the hearings.

Mr. WRIGHT. The committee got the information. I am not going to disclose the officer's name here to-day because I promised I would not.

Mr. BYRNS. What does the gentleman think would happen to him?

Mr. WRIGHT. Many things might happen to him. He furnished me information, and I promised to protect him.

Mr. JAMES. What would happen to an officer who gave the committee such information in the open?

Mr. WRIGHT. I imagine he would not be promoted.

The next day he brought me a list, all of which I will not read. He said: "Suspend the national rifle matches for one year and save half a million dollars; suspend for one year the citizens' military training camps and thereby save over two and one-half million dollars." He said: "So far as the Reserve Officers' Corps is concerned save over \$2,000,000 there by cutting out the ten thousand 14-day trainees," and that we acted upon.

These suggestions are brought to the House on the recommendation of a high Army officer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDRIGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BALDRIGE. What was the name of the Army officer?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will not tell the gentleman. I would suffer my right arm to be severed from my body before I would tell, because I promised the officer I would not divulge his name.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The appropriation was cut \$15,000,000 upon suggestions made by the Chief of Engineers, was it not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. The Bureau of the Budget cut the estimate from \$75,000,000 to \$60,000,000, and the committee adopted the Budget estimate.

Mr. CULKIN. It has been cut \$15,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. It has been cut \$15,000,000.

This morning's mail brings me a letter from a reserve officer of high rank, a major. I am not going to read all of the letter, for I will not have time. I shall read only one or two sentences:

First, let me say that any reserve officer who is not willing to go to camp for actual transportation and subsistence is not worthy of holding a commission in the Army of the United States.

Further, he says:

For myself, I can not say that I am entitled to go to camp this summer, but I have qualified for the command and General Staff School at Leavenworth, and although it is great disappointment to me to miss it, I can honestly say that any reserve officer who is not willing to cut down expenses at this time is not sincere in his supposed patriotism.

Mr. GOSS and Mr. MARTIN of Oregon rose.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will yield to one gentleman, but I can not yield to two.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. What kind of a man do you think it is who will not let his name be published in connection with information he furnishes?

Mr. WRIGHT. I expect things came up while the gentleman from Oregon was in the Army in connection with which he did not want his name to be given.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Any scalawag who will not let his name be used—

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman is going to call this man a scalawag, he might have to meet him face to face.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. That is all right. The gentleman should divulge his name.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not going to divulge his name, because I told him I would not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed both to the substitute and to the original motion.

We have not time to discuss the effect upon all the waterways of this country such a proposition would have. I shall not refer to the Tennessee River, nor to the Mississippi River, nor to the Missouri River, nor to the port of Baltimore, and the other major ports that are vitally interested in the appropriation carried in the bill at this time. I will simply refer to one case, that of the Great Lakes. The rivers and harbors bill of 1930 carried a provision authorizing \$24,000,000 for the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes. The division engineer at Cleveland, Colonel Markham, informed me day before yesterday that if the work could be prosecuted now without delay, it could be done for far less than \$20,000,000, and result in a saving of some six or seven millions of dollars to the Government under the estimate made in 1929.

Furthermore, the boats are idle upon the Great Lakes this summer, as I am reliably informed. They do not expect to carry more than 12,000,000 tons the present year, when they usually carry 130,000,000 tons. The boats are tied up in Cleveland and in all the ports on the Great Lakes. The connecting channels are virtually idle, and now, above all times, he informs me, perhaps a double amount of work

could be done in a given time than could be done when all those boats are in operation. [Applause.]

Let me give you an instance by illustration. By actual demonstration it has been found that some five years ago at a point in the Detroit River, three boats passed a given point, going in one direction or the other, every two minutes. Just think of that, gentlemen. And when you come to the channels between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, with the locks in operation and boats constantly going through them, with several hundred boats passing there in a day's time, when could they do the work better than they can at this time, when those boats are idle? It would result in the saving of many millions of dollars to this Government by prosecuting the work at this time, with the least possible interference with business. It would be no interference with the great steel industry, because they tell me they expect to operate for 30 months on the ore they now have, and it is hoped that before the expiration of that time all these connecting channels will be completed and that then business, if it revives, can push along perhaps as never before in our history. [Applause.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I disagree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDuffie], I can certainly understand the provocation which prompted his offering that amendment. Why, the Committee on Appropriations came out with a real constructive bill effecting substantial economies. We have stood on this floor and seen this bill torn to pieces and about \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000 added to it.

Mr. BALDRIGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No. I am sorry.

I can understand how some of the gentlemen are seeking an alibi in order to offset what they have added to this bill. [Applause.]

I have given you figures showing the number of labor days on each million dollars. I obtained those figures from the office of the Chief of Engineers. Those figures show 60,000 labor days for every million dollars appropriated for river and harbor work and 77,000 labor days for every million dollars for flood-control work. But if that does not impress you, permit me to talk to my colleagues over here. President Hoover, on March 14, 1932, sent a special message asking an immediate appropriation for river and harbor works. He asked for \$60,000,000 and stated:

As delay seems inevitable and unless some action be taken, a large number of men will be thrown out of work and other expenses incurred by suspension of work.

Here is the entire message:

[House of Representatives, Document No. 272, Seventy-second Congress, first session]

IMMEDIATE APPROPRIATION FOR RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS

Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting request that the Congress give consideration to immediate appropriation of the funds for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works in order that we may avoid the unemployment and dislocation which will rise from such delay.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 14, 1932.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SIR: It appears that the regular War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933 will be delayed beyond the usual time. The Budget estimate for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works for 1933 is \$60,000,000, which would become immediately available upon the passage of the act. I am now advised by the Secretary of War that, depending upon the usual course of appropriations, the engineers have entered upon certain contracts, the continuance of which have depended upon the passage of the appropriation at the usual time. As delay seems inevitable and unless some action be taken, a large number of men will be thrown out of work and other expenses incurred by suspension of work. I therefore recommend that the Congress give consideration to immediate appropriation of the funds for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works in order that we may avoid the unemployment and dislocation which will arise from such delays. Such a course would imply no increase in the contemplated expenditures.

I inclose herewith the recommendations of the Director of the Budget.

Respectfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, March 14, 1932.

SIR: The Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, on page 596, contains an estimate of appropriation of \$60,000,000 for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, as follows:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS

"To be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

"Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 661); and for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, \$60,000,000 (U. S. C., title 33, secs. 541, 622, 661; act Feb. 23, 1931, vol. 46, p. 1306)."

The Secretary of War advises as follows:

"The department has been actively prosecuting river and harbor work with funds heretofore appropriated. It was considered in the public interest to press the work during the past winter season in the interest of the unemployment situation, and to advance the work under present favorable conditions of prices. It is prepared to undertake the vigorous prosecution of the work during the summer season now approaching. Anticipating the passage of the War Department appropriation before April of this year, contracts contingent upon this appropriation have been entered into and the contractors have engaged labor and material to proceed with the work.

"The funds from prior appropriations available for this work are, however, so reduced that it will soon be necessary to suspend operations on many important projects and lay off a considerable force of men unless additional funds are soon appropriated. It is the understanding of this department that the passage of the War Department appropriation act for the coming fiscal year is not to be anticipated for some time."

In view of the conditions set forth by the Secretary of War, it is recommended that this matter be brought to the attention of Congress, with request that the estimate of \$60,000,000 contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1933, for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, be given special consideration at this time with a view to having river and harbor funds made available at an early date.

Very respectfully,

J. CLAWSON ROOP,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDENT.

Now, are you going to stand by the President? There can be no doubt in this instance as to what the President said, because I have it here in writing. [Applause.]

Now, I want to ask my colleague from New York how he can possibly stand up here and urge his amendment in the face of this message asking that this appropriation be made immediately available by reason of the emergency character of the work involved?

Gentlemen, this House is going to take action within a very few days on a gigantic measure which will bring employment to several million people. Only a few minutes ago the distinguished Speaker of this House issued a statement to the whole country stating that he approved and would sponsor—and I know the House will follow him—legislation increasing by a billion dollars the amount now made available for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I tell you the country is going to respond to this leadership of the Speaker of the House. The Speaker's statement is statesmanlike, and it is very generous in that he offers to place in the hands of the President of the United States \$100,000,000. In addition to that, he recommends another billion dollars for public works. He outlines the details of this program; and I invite every Member of this House to study carefully the Garner plan, which was made public only a few minutes ago. [Applause.]

Now, then, can we, in the face of this, stand for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama? I say that in view of the fact that we are going to authorize loans to States, to subdivisions thereof, and loans to semi-public corporations, all in an effort to create work and to stimulate industry in order to save the country. We are

now on the eve of a complete collapse, and something drastic must be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert at this point the encouraging and timely statement made by Speaker GARNER of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Ever since Congress met in December it has been discussing and undertaking to pass legislation that would be helpful in relieving the present distressing economic conditions. Some far-reaching legislation has been placed upon the statute books. I have been hopeful that these legislative efforts would tend to bring about better conditions, but the facts are that the unemployment and distress of the people are greater now than when Congress was organized last December.

I am unalterably opposed to the dole, but it must be apparent that before Congress adjourns some real effort must be made toward taking care of the unemployment situation as well as the people who are in physical distress as a result of lack of food and rainfall.

It is evident that the situation can not be remedied by international negotiations to remove barriers and restrictions upon international commerce, since the present administration will not permit legislation of this nature. Therefore we must consider what, if anything, can be done to improve the situation by direct action of the Government. To that end I have three suggestions to offer, and I sincerely hope that the administration will consider them and cooperate with the Congress in their enactment into legislation:

First, I would pass what is known as the Huddleston bill, which has for its purpose the placing in the hands of the President \$100,000,000 to be used as he deems necessary to relieve extreme suffering in any section of the country. If it is not necessary to use it, of course it will not be used. This is in accord with the action of the Congress in 1898, when it placed in the hands of President McKinley, as well as the commanding general of the Army in the Philippines, \$100,000,000 to be expended as his judgment might deem advisable in the defense of the country. Likewise, in 1917, \$100,000,000 were placed at the disposal of President Wilson for similar purposes. It has been said, with some degree of truth, that the present condition is more distressing to the people of this Nation than in either 1898 or 1917, and surely we can trust the President to use the \$100,000,000 patriotically and wisely for the purpose intended.

Second, I would broaden the base of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, permit it to exercise its judgment in making loans without any restriction whatever, and add \$1,000,000,000 to its authorized issue, making the total three billion instead of two, as at present. This would enable that corporation to loan funds to States, counties, and cities where legal and adequate security could be offered. It would also permit that corporation to exercise its good judgment in making loans to individuals or corporations where adequate security is offered and where it is assured that labor would be employed.

The principal purpose of the original reconstruction act was twofold—to sustain credit of banks and corporations and to loan money to industrial corporations, such as railways, for the employment of additional labor. There has been little or none of the second purpose brought about. The principal activities of the corporation up to this time have been to sustain the credit of banks and other corporate interests by taking their frozen assets and making them loans upon the same which could not be had otherwise; and in loaning money to railway corporations largely for the purpose of paying interest and maturing obligations. We surely can trust the present board to administer wisely the additional duties as they are administering the present limited duties.

Third, I would provide for the issuance of a billion dollars' worth of bonds for the purpose of a governmental building program, based largely upon laws already passed by Congress and approved by the President. In order that there might be no infringing upon the present Budget obligation, I would levy a tax at the same time to take care of the interest and sinking fund. This procedure would be economically sound and would give considerable employment to labor in the different sections of the country and make provisions for governmental activities which must be had, under any conditions, in the near future.

Of course, the first question asked under the third suggestion would probably be "What taxes would you levy?" I have not tried to make a survey with the view of offering suggestions, but, speaking for myself only, I would levy one-third of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline. Of course, this and other taxes of similar nature would be repealed as soon as conditions improve to the point where our revenue from income, inheritance, and corporation taxes would meet our expenditures.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says that in his opinion the Chief of Engineers can go along with the projects that have been laid out. I would like to know when the gentleman

from New York qualified as an expert civil engineer and where he gets his information that the Chief of Engineers can go along just the same with a reduction in the appropriation?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman read the daily newspapers and keep track of the prices of material and labor that have been going down and have resulted in tremendous profits to the contractors who have taken Government work?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is going to get a reasonable bid from a contractor, and he will take into consideration the prevailing price of material as well as the prevailing wage scale, as well as any other outstanding features that enter into the proposal, and it has always been his policy to do the work if he does not get a reasonable bid or one that is within his estimate. The engineers have handled numerous projects just because the contractors would not come within the estimates.

Mr. TABER. And the bids are going to be a great deal lower than they were a year ago.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If so, the work will progress faster. That is what we want. We want the job completed. The sooner the better. In fact, it would be better to complete the work in a year or two rather than over a period of years. It must be done.

I am in favor of balancing the Budget, but I am not going to vote to balance the Budget at the expense of the laboring people of this country. [Applause.] It is far more important, as I said the other day when the Muscle Shoals bill was pending, to place the people of this country at work than to balance the Budget. We can balance the Budget and still provide work for the unemployed.

Your Secretary of the Treasury, in a speech on December 14, in New York, placed in the RECORD the following day by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], stated that it is folly to assume that the issuance of \$2,000,000,000 or more of bonds would in any way impair the credit of this country.

I say to you, as was stated before, that you are going to vote on legislation that will be beneficial to the millions out of work before we adjourn, and you are going to vote for it, and you will probably appropriate more money for rivers and harbors work than is carried in this bill. You must lead the way to meet the unemployment situation.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not a fact that the Chief of Engineers eliminated from the program everything except what is regarded as absolutely essential?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have no direct information as to what the Chief of Engineers has eliminated. I will take the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. BRIGGS. Do not the hearings show that?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Probably so. I hope the Chief of Engineers will go ahead with this public work that will give employment to some of the 8,000,000 men now out of work.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has it not been shown that these activities are not only essential activities of the Government from the standpoint of economy in moving the great commerce of this country but that these activities are giving employment to the people at the lowest possible cost to the Government?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Absolutely. Here is an opportunity to complete work that you are eventually going to complete, and you can complete it for less money than you will be able to finish the job if you wait several years. Why not take advantage of the situation and go ahead with the projects that have been surveyed and authorized? Some of them are half completed. Some of them are almost completed. The engineers are ready to go, and they are waiting for this money, as the President stated in his recent message when he asked for \$60,000,000. The President urged an immediate appropriation.

I am sorry the Committee on Appropriations did not bring out a resolution appropriating the money that the

President asked for, because it would mean that men would go to work immediately, and not have to wait until July 1.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that both amendments will be voted down. There are other ways to economize without stopping public improvements or at the expense of the unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a brief article upon the subject which I have just discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following editorial from the St. Louis Star of May 16:

FOURTEEN FRONTS

Speaker GARNER states nothing but the bald truth when he says Mr. Hoover has done more to freeze public confidence than anybody else in the country. The President's daily statements have been an advertisement of his bewilderment. He said last January that fighting a depression was like a great war, "not a battle upon a single front but upon many fronts," yet all the time he has been fighting a rear-guard action upon a single front—that of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The St. Louis Star pointed this out when Mr. Hoover addressed Congress last January. Recognizing that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was needed to support railroad credit and to relieve pressure on insurance companies and banks, the Star then said:

"Is this measure calculated to increase freight tonnage, which is the one great need of the railroads? Not at all. It is simply to reduce the financial consequences of lack of business. It is a binding up of wounds, a trying to catch up with what has already happened. . . . What is lacking in Mr. Hoover's outlook? One trouble seems to be that, appealing to the country to dismiss its illogical fears, he has more fears than anybody else. He fears inflation of the public debt, hence will not consent to a public-works program that would vitalize a hundred lines of industry. . . . He fears the tariff overlords of the Republican Party. . . . He will not move against the 12-hour day and child labor in southern textile mills. . . . Nor will he move against conditions that are ruining both miner and operator in the coal industry. Controlled production in demoralized industries for the common benefit of capital, labor, and the public is beyond Mr. Hoover's ken."

Whenever anybody proposes a general plan of action Mr. Hoover calls it a panacea and says panaceas won't work. Of course they won't. But what is a panacea? It is a single remedy for all disease. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, valuable within its limits, was Mr. Hoover's panacea, and it failed to work a cure. So, too, the bond issue for public works, to which the President has been driven by political and economic compulsion, will fail if it stands alone.

If the battle must be fought on "many fronts," let's have a list of them. Here are 14:

1. Issue bonds for a broad program of public works, including the wiping out of slum districts through loans to be amortized in rents.
2. Continue the forcible inflation of credit and currency through the Federal reserve, keeping in mind that this will not restore business and prices except as an aid to a trend already in progress.
3. Compel the spread of employment by shortening hours sufficiently to absorb the population rendered idle by labor-saving machinery. Do this through Federal power over interstate commerce or through corporation income tax graduations.
4. Resubmit the child labor law to the United States Supreme Court, recognizing that the court's decision in the Indiana chain-store case was a reversal of the doctrine on which the 1922 child-labor decision was based. End the demoralization of interstate commerce by unscrupulous producers in backward States.
5. Repeal the antitrust laws, substituting automatic regulation of business through an excess-profits tax coupled with Federal supervision over issuance of stocks and bonds, thus helping business to a reasonable profit and directing part of the excess profits into the pockets of labor.
6. Force a reorganization of the coal and oil industries to make them profitable for their owners, raise the purchasing power of their employees, and conserve natural resources in which the people have a supreme stake.
7. Give the Interstate Commerce Commission the same authority over truck, bus, and river transportation that it has over the railroads, and do it before the trucking of freight at cut-throat prices bankrupts the railroads.
8. Repeal the railroad earnings recapture law, leaving railroads subject to an excess-profits tax.
9. Write the words of the sixteenth amendment, "From whatever sources received," into the income tax law, thus ending evasion of the income surtax through tax-exempt securities. The Supreme Court virtually invited Congress to do this, in the California franchise-tax opinion last month.
10. Raise income surtaxes, inheritance and gift taxes high enough to aid in the redistribution of wealth and enable the masses of the people to buy the products of industry and share in its ownership.
11. Vastly extend the reforestation of marginal farm lands both for timber benefits and to reduce the agricultural surplus which

depresses farm prices. Stop reclamation of swamp and desert land; stop overgrazing on the national domain.

12. Cooperate with the rest of the world in getting rid of the reparations and war-debt deadlock, now paralyzing world recovery. Collect whatever can be absorbed in additional imports, the only form of international payment possible.

13. Make a start toward lowering of tariff barriers, recognizing that the "most-favored-nation" principle has been destroyed by customs unions and import quotas.

14. Call a world monetary conference to deal with the loss of silver's buying power.

Mr. Chairman, regardless as to whether we agree with all the suggestions in the editorial from the St. Louis Star, it must be conceded that the writer seeks at least to offer what he feels are constructive suggestions to meet the situation that confronts not only the Congress and the administration but the entire country. While we are chosen to write the laws of the country, still there is a duty that every citizen owes his country, and that duty, as I see it, now calls for the cooperation of all citizens in the effort being made to overcome the depression that has had a grip on our Nation for several years.

The editorial, in part, suggests the raising of income taxes, surtaxes, inheritance and gift taxes high enough to aid in the redistribution of wealth and enable the masses of the people to buy the products of industry and share in its ownership.

I am frank to say I voted for the increases in income, inheritance, and gift taxes carried in the revenue bill as it passed the House. In doing so I felt that I should consider the question of ability to pay. Considering conditions, the suggested rates were not confiscatory. For that vote I have been criticized.

I realize there are few rich men left in comparison with those who were fortunate enough to possess large sums and who earned large incomes prior to 1929. There was no thought in my mind to deal unfairly with the rich, other than one class, and that class was our citizens who had accumulated large fortunes in this country and who have sent over \$3,000,000,000 abroad for investment in factories in foreign countries, where there are now being manufactured by cheap labor, the articles that were formerly manufactured in this country and shipped abroad. As the result of investing this vast sum of money abroad our foreign trade has been greatly reduced; in fact, aided by the tariff, the foreign trade of this country faces destruction. And that is not all. We read where other Americans are seeking sites for factories, Lord Derby stating in a recent speech that some 25 American corporations would soon be erecting factories in England. The shoe industry of my city, St. Louis, I am sure realizes that it must meet the competition of foreign factories erected with American money. Of course, a man has the right to invest his money as he sees fit, but is it not reasonable to feel that Americans should have some thought for their own country and their fellow citizens?

I spoke in favor of and in every way aided the efforts to adopt an amendment that would have denied certain deductions to Americans who had made large investments, not in securities, but in factories in foreign countries. I have no apology to offer for that.

One of the letters I received criticizing the Congress for raising the income, surtaxes, inheritance, and gift taxes came from a well-known attorney of my city whose specialty is handling income and estate tax cases before the Internal Revenue Bureau. He wrote, in part:

Of course, those who do not care to pay the taxes will find the means of avoiding; but resort to such means is also destructive, because money is placed in trust or other inactive holding and withdrawn from business credits.

In speaking of the tax on stock transfers he said:

The proposed tax upon stock transfers is about the most destructive proposition that I can conceive. Of course, the business of dealers in securities is already very precarious, but I am not thinking of them.

Moreover, such a tax is so easy to avoid that if it becomes high enough to justify the effort the tax will not be collected. For instance, there is at present under consideration a plan, if this tax is imposed, of organizing corporations in other countries, say, Canada, which will be merely holding agents.

Mark you, he says a plan is already under consideration. The tax has not as yet been imposed.

He then proceeded to advise me at length how this would work, and added that this was only one of several schemes that could be resorted to to evade taxes.

I had been engaged for weeks with the Economy Committee, working day and night, and when I came to my office one evening and found that letter I became rather irritated, especially when the thought came to me that the writer was one who would probably be in a position to show the taxpayer how to evade the tax, owing to the fact that he could be classed as an expert in tax matters.

I do not say that he would show citizens how to evade the tax, for I have no information that would warrant me to say that he is anything but an honorable man.

I hastily dictated a response. I told the gentleman that I had voted for the taxes of which he complained. I further stated that the time had come when there must be a redistribution of the wealth of the country. I did, however, fail to further explain my view in regard to the redistribution of wealth. This left my communication open to criticism. It could be construed in many ways—in fact, in any way the reader desired to construe it. One could say I favored by force or by most radical legislation depriving those who possessed wealth of their just holdings.

Mr. Chairman, the mere mention of redistribution of wealth causes many to shudder, to become astonished. The thought is misconstrued. There is no desire upon the part of anyone who has offered such a suggestion to boldly scatter among the many the holdings of a few. The real thought as I understand it is that there should be a less inequitable distribution of wealth and income.

Even had Congress adopted the higher income and estate taxes, the wealthy and their children still would have retained the bulk of great fortunes and there is no desire to deny them to maintain and distribute among their heirs the greater part of their holdings. Compare, if you please, the laws of Great Britain and other foreign countries in this respect with the laws of the United States. There is no comparison. The rates abroad are far greater than ours. There is a strong feeling that in these present times the very wealthy, however, should not be willing to pile up higher surpluses while millions are in want.

Mr. Chairman, I have no thought other than that expressed in the Constitution, which grants to our citizens the right to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. However, there are citizens who possess great wealth who have, by the creation of trust funds, and investments in tax-exempt securities, not only failed to do their just share toward meeting the expenses of the Government but, on the contrary, have found legal ways to evade the intent of our legislative bodies and escaped taxation, thus placing additional burdens upon others who possess wealth, and who have invested their money in business so as to provide work for their fellow man. It is this class that has evaded taxation I would reach, either by amendment to the Constitution or by legislation if possible, so that in the end the burden of meeting the taxes would be more equitably distributed than at present.

I favor protecting the rights of the man who has money and who is being pinched to meet his tax assessments and who meets the assessments. It is this class of our citizens that I seek to benefit as well as the masses of the people in my effort to find a way to require those who have hoarded their money in such a manner as to make it practically impossible for the Government and the States to reach. If this is not done, then I predict that these swollen fortunes will continue to increase; and if this prediction be correct, then where and how will the Government, national State, and cities secure the revenue that is necessary to carry on? It is unfair, in my opinion, to require those who have their fortunes invested in business to carry all the burden while part of it should be met by others whose income can be classed as unearned income. Would we not be able to in part redistribute the wealth of this class if we can find a way to tax their holdings?

Many trust funds created by immensely wealthy people at the time of their death are practically perpetual. Some provide for their continuance until there is no issue, which will mean a hundred years or more in some cases.

Considering our method of raising revenue up to 20 or 25 years ago, naturally it does appear to some that the rates applied by the House bill as well as the bill reported by the Senate border on confiscation, and those who take this view complain bitterly. I had a telegram from one of our outstanding business men who classed it as sheer communism.

We resorted during the war to methods unheard of prior thereto in our effort to raise revenue. There was no complaint, because we were at war, fighting for our very existence. At the conclusion of the war our country found itself burdened with billions of debts which, of course, must be paid. European nations owed us billions, and we have found it necessary not only to reduce those debts but now find it impossible even to collect the interest. There was no objection to the President's declaration for a moratorium. The business man did not realize then that he would be called upon to meet expenditures that had previously been taken care of by applying the money we received annually from the foreign countries. He is now awake to that fact.

We are faced with another war—a war against a depression that threatens our existence. Never in our history have we in peace time been confronted with such a critical situation. It is this fact that requires the raising of additional money, that requires the passage of legislation that would not be given serious thought if conditions were normal. We are accused of being radicals, and what not. There are various schools of thought offering suggestions as to how we can best meet conditions that confront us.

Members of Congress are not radicals when they express themselves and demand that those who have ability to pay should be taxed.

With eight to ten millions of our citizens out of work, as many more working part time, and some thirty or forty millions of our population depending upon those people for food and shelter, methods must be resorted to that of course will be resented by many. They are unusual but conditions require the action.

When conditions were normal the business man did not complain, in fact he urged the Congress to enact legislation that called for expansion, the creation of bureaus and commissions, that resulted in mounting expenditures, but now he demands that overnight all the activities that he helped to create be destroyed, and his criticism is critical.

Getting back to the communication I received from the attorney, I further stated in my letter, referring to the attorney's statement that ways would be found to evade the taxes, that I was not disturbed by such a threat and that such a threat would in no way affect my decision. I added that it would be for the better if those assessed would willingly meet the assessment, for if they did not Congress would find a way to relieve them of their holdings. By that I meant that Congress would provide ways and means for the collection of the revenue if existing laws were not sufficient. The man who now deliberately and fraudulently defeats the tax laws, if discovered in the end, is required to pay heavy penalties, additional assessments, and interest that rises to amounts that are practically confiscatory, and, further than that, many are sent to prison for tax evasions. That law is now on the statute books, and it is true that many men have practically been relieved of all their holdings who have been found to be deliberately evading the taxes. To my personal knowledge nearly 1,500 such cases are now pending and under investigation by the Treasury Department. The attorney who wrote me is well aware of this fact. The Economy Committee was advised if it would give the intelligence division more money for additional agents millions due the Government could be collected.

There is a demand from leading economists, from leaders in world affairs, representative groups, including the clergy, as well as the great newspapers of the country, for a change—a change from conditions which they claim have

brought us to our knees. Can they all be wrong? Time alone will tell.

This is no period to excite the masses, but, on the contrary, we should all strive regardless of our own welfare to bring about a change for the better.

Concluding, Mr. Chairman, I submit that what we need in this country at this time is confidence. Fear and despair have been handed out to the general public, where those in command of our country and its institutions should be assuming the opposite attitude. The people have become fearful of the future, have hoarded their money when it should be at work. Idle money makes for bad times. Many statements have been made concerning money that is being hoarded. There is no doubt but that several billion dollars in this country is idle at this moment. In an effort to get some information along this line, something upon which one might be able to offer definite statistics, I wrote the Secretary of the Treasury for information relative to the amount of old—large—currency that was still outstanding and had never been offered for redemption. You rarely ever see any old money these days, still the Treasury Department advises me that \$538,496,159 of old currency is still outstanding. It is not in circulation, because the minute it reaches a bank it would be sent to the Treasury for redemption.

On top of this there are \$39,993,670 in Government securities which have ceased to draw interest still outstanding, never submitted to the department for redemption. The department letter in reply to mine follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 21, 1932.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the Secretary, and in reply to your letter of May 18, 1932, the following information is furnished.

The amount of old-series (large-size) currency outstanding on April 30, 1932, was as follows:

United States notes.....	\$41,775,856
Silver certificates.....	45,679,816
Gold certificates.....	151,346,829
Treasury notes of 1890.....	1,224,800
National bank notes.....	82,229,003
Federal reserve notes.....	213,409,765
Federal reserve bank notes.....	2,830,090
Total.....	538,496,159

The outstanding matured debt, on which interest has ceased, on April 30, 1932, was as follows:

Old debt, issued prior to Apr. 1, 1917.....	\$1,642,320
Second Liberty loan 4 and 4½ bonds (interest ceased Nov. 15, 1927).....	3,180,100
Third Liberty loan 4½ bonds (interest ceased Sept. 15, 1928).....	5,281,250
3½ per cent Victory notes (interest ceased June 15, 1922).....	19,200
4½ per cent Victory notes (interest ceased Dec. 15, 1922, and May 20, 1923).....	1,115,600
Treasury notes (various issues).....	15,129,750
Treasury certificates of indebtedness (various issues).....	9,581,600
Treasury bills (various issues).....	3,253,000
Treasury savings certificates (various issues).....	790,850
Total.....	39,993,670

Very truly yours,

A. A. BALLANTINE,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives, United States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, years ago, for days at a time, I held up annually several river and harbor bills, and did it successfully, with the aid of Senators at the other end of the Capitol. We stopped some of these wasteful projects. When I spoke to those leading on my side of the aisle the other day, after I had been asked to do so, and inquired if they wanted me to talk upon this item, they said yes, and I asked when. They answered, when the \$60,000,000 paragraph comes up. There are 400 projects involved here in one paragraph, and only a few minutes to discuss them.

I agree with what has been said about unemployment. I have introduced unemployment-aid bills, but by far the

greater part of this \$60,000,000 river and harbor expenditure goes to contractors and dredgers. I have been over many projects in this bill, including several down in Texas, extending to Freeport, traveling with the father of the gentleman from Texas who has just spoken—a very able man, by the way, as was his father—and I have been over many waterway projects throughout this country. I live alongside the Mississippi River. I have one harbor in my State that is the second largest harbor in the United States. Its total cost to the Government is less than 5 per cent of the cost of the Ohio and other single rivers I could name. It had 45,000,000 tons of commerce in 1930, more than the Mississippi, the Missouri, and Ohio Rivers put together—yes; ten times more actual commerce is carried by the Superior-Duluth port, because most of the commerce on these rivers reported by engineers is sand and gravel, except on the Ohio River, where \$150,000,000 of Government money has been spent and only comparatively little coal and steel are carried. In these days of stress and heavy tax burdens it is wasteful beyond measure to appropriate \$60,000,000 for such rivers and harbors.

There is not now a ghost of a chance for Members to pass a reduction amendment. I am not talking with that belief, but to call attention to disciples of economy who frantically seek to shave a few dollars from questionable savings and then eagerly vote for this great pork barrel. Every man that is interested in any project is here. The entire Committee on Rivers and Harbors, composed of 21 Members, is here, I assume, or very nearly all, and they will vote for every provision in the bill, good, bad, and indifferent. So, too, with a hundred Members who would be ready to oppose many "projects" if singly presented but will not dare to oppose a bill that carries their own project.

I am just calling your attention to these things because you are entitled to know about them, and the country should know the pork barrel is again here. On page 120 of the hearings you will find that 150 projects have been recommended for abandonment by the engineers of the Army, whom you praise so highly, and the committee has not abandoned one of them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. I wish I could do so, but I have only a few minutes. On these projects, recommended for abandonment by the Army engineers, you are appropriating money to-day that is being used by the Army engineers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I have called your attention to it and I will read the data into my speech. It is in the hearings, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] asked the questions, and the cost is from \$10 to \$12 a ton for the Government to float a two-foot draft boat on this one creek.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are appropriating now in lump sums.

Mr. FREAR. You are appropriating in lump sums, but the engineers use it on these projects recommended for abandonment that the committee will not abandon. I read from page 130 of the hearings:

General PILLSBURY. While some of these projects were recommended for abandonment, they have not been abandoned by Congress, and as long as there is navigation we feel this incumbent to maintain the channel.

Mr. BARBOUR. And there was a little over a thousand tons handled on that river last year (Chipola River, Fla.).

General PILLSBURY. The commerce amounted to 1,649 tons.

Mr. BARBOUR. That would mean at the rate of about \$10 or \$12 a ton on the river?

General PILLSBURY. Yes; about \$10 or \$12 a ton (resin carried 16 miles, p. 525, vol. 2, Engineers' Report, 1931).

You will find \$6,600,000 is carried in this bill for the Missouri River that was also reported against by the Army Engineers. You can not find an Army engineer in the country that ever recommended the Missouri River for improvement. It is a land reclamation scheme that will cost the Government \$80,000,000 on the Missouri, according to the reports, without any local contribution. It was put in by a distinguished Senator over on the other side of the Capitol, because I was before the Senate committee at that time. He

held up the river and harbor bill until he got the Missouri River included. It was a tribute to his power, but does not carry any real commerce and is never likely to do so. That is going to cost the Government \$89,000,000 for this commerceless river before completion, and is for reclamation rather than for any commerce now or hereafter.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have not the time, I regret, but will say there is an appropriation of \$4,900,000 which goes to the Illinois River for the gentleman from Illinois now speaking, where there is no commerce at all and never likely to be after \$11,000,000 is spent. You talk for it day after day, and your project is much like the useless Hennepin Canal. Four million nine hundred thousand dollars, as an adjunct to the Chicago drainage canal, and you object to cutting anything out of this bill. It is, in my judgment, one of the most wasteful items carried by this \$60,000,000 paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. No; I regret I can not yield. My time is too limited. Four million nine hundred thousand dollars—why is the Illinois gentleman here defending the bill, I ask? American taxpayers are paying \$11,000,000 for this Illinois River project. That is the trouble. With these projects in the bill you will all unite against any amendment to reduce the \$60,000,000 pork barrel. If left alone, not one project in four, I submit, could get past the House, but put into a pork barrel, you can not get away from it, for all are included, good, bad, and indifferent.

Nearly \$50,000,000 is going to be put by the Government into a 200-mile project on the Mississippi River, 200 miles between the mouth of the Ohio and the Illinois rivers. There is no commerce there to justify 1 per cent of that amount, for we are lining the bottom with silver dollars at \$250,000 per mile on this 200-mile stretch for only a few tons of real commerce.

A Member living near this project said to me the other day, "Why, FREAR, you are right on these projects. You always were." I know the situation, and believe it will be impossible to change it, but I am telling the House what you are passing in this \$60,000,000 item. It should be reduced 10 per cent according to the amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin makes the statement that a large amount of money is going to be spent on projects that have been abandoned by the engineers. That was not the testimony before the committee.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I made no such statement. I said there was money being spent on abandoned projects. I did not say a "large amount."

Mr. CLAGUE. The Chief of Engineers said no money was going to be spent on abandoned projects.

Mr. FREAR. I will put it in the Record.

Mr. McDUFFIE. There is no money being spent on abandoned projects.

Mr. CLAGUE. I know of no money being spent on abandoned projects. I heard the testimony of the engineers before the committee on several occasions.

Now, the Budget estimate cut \$15,000,000 from amount recommended by the engineers, therefore this appropriation has been cut to the bone. The President of the United States, two or three years ago, in a statement he gave out, said that these river channels should be completed for operation in about eight years. That was the intention of the Chief of Engineers. They have passed on these river projects and say that they should be completed.

When the Chief of Engineers came before the committee he said that with \$60,000,000 it would be impossible to complete the same in eight years, and that to do that it would require an annual appropriation of \$75,000,000 for eight years.

Now, as has been stated by the gentleman from St. Louis, we are going to appropriate before the session closes not millions but two or three billion dollars to put people back

to work. There is no question about that. I am in favor of taking care of the rivers that can be made navigable.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is it not true that the money put into river and harbor work gives employment to more labor than any other money expended by the Government?

Mr. CLAGUE. That is absolutely true. There is less machinery used in river and harbor work than in any other kind of employment; the great amount of labor is performed by hand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. I will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Minnesota was here at the passage of the river and harbor bill referred to, and that the committee did not report that but it was put in on the floor, and the gentleman from Wisconsin himself voted for it?

Mr. CLAGUE. That is a fact. Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, \$15,000,000 has been cut by the committee from the engineer's estimate. The amount carried in the bill is less than it should be. Vote down these amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the amendment which seeks to reduce the appropriation for river and harbor improvement and maintenance. The Chief of Engineers urged that \$75,000,000 be appropriated for river and harbor work during the next fiscal year. However, this bill reduces the amount to \$60,000,000, which is \$15,000,000 less than the Board of Engineers deem necessary for the efficient and adequate prosecution of this work. I recognize that there is an urgent need for drastic reduction of governmental expenditures and that the people of the Nation are demanding that we practice sound economy wherever possible. My record will show that I have supported practically every sound economy measure that has been submitted to this House for consideration.

I have also opposed many large appropriations that I deemed unnecessary and improper, but, Mr. Chairman, there is a vast distinction between sound economy and false economy, and I think that the reduction of appropriations for river and harbor work at a time when 10,000,000 of citizens are unemployed and when every effort of the Government should be devoted to the great task of finding employment for our people would be indefensible. It is true that I have in my district the Sabine-Neches waterway, which has become one of the most important waterways in the United States. It is true that the tonnage that is moved over this waterway has increased tremendously, and that this waterway has made it possible for great industries that furnish employment to thousands of our people to locate in Jefferson County. Naturally I am very anxious to support a program which means so much to the people of my district. But in addition to this, Mr. Chairman, there are other potent reasons which justify my support of river and harbor improvement. The farmers of my district, as well as those of the State of Texas, are vitally interested in the development of our waterway transportation.

Our very distinguished and able chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, upon which I have the honor to serve, recently furnished me with some very interesting information in regard to the effect of waterway development upon the transportation costs of shipping cotton. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to our splendid chairman for this information and to take this opportunity to compliment him upon the splendid and able manner with which he has presided over this important committee. I feel that the State of Texas has been signally honored on account of his elevation to this important chairmanship, and the manner in which he has performed his duties in this respect has reflected credit upon the entire State. According to this information, the Houston channel was completed to 30-foot depth in 1926, and the Sabine-Neches ports in 1927. The Sabine-Neches ports received a material widening of channels and other improvements, which were completed in 1930.

Houston received similar improvements, completed in 1931. Galveston received 2 feet additional depth, completed in 1929. Corpus Christi was completed to a 25-foot depth in 1926. It was authorized for 30 feet in the river and harbor bill of 1930 and completed to that depth some time last year.

The freight rates on cotton exports from Texas ports to British ports, as charged by the United States Shipping Board vessels, have been as follows: In the latter part of the year 1926 and the whole of the year 1927 the rate on Texas cotton was 60 cents per 100 pounds, or \$3 per bale. In 1928, 1929, and 1930 it ranged around 53 cents to 55 cents per 100 pounds. In 1931 and 1932 the first-class Shipping Board rates went down to 45 cents to British ports, while contract rates on high-density cotton went down to 35 cents per 100.

The Mediterranean conference reduced the rates to Italian and Spanish ports for the past and present years from 45 cents to 35 cents per 100. The United Kingdom conference did the same thing on British shipments. The Bordeaux-Hamburg Range Conference reduced the rates from 45 cents to 30 cents per 100. The rates to the Far East a few years ago were on a 60-cent basis to Japan and 65 cents to Shanghai. At the present time these rates are 35 cents to Japan and 40 cents to Shanghai.

On Wednesday, August 26, 1931, the Houston Chronicle had a press report on cotton rates. The headlines were "Ship cotton rates again are reduced." This report showed that rates to certain ports, including Havre, Ghent, Rotterdam, Hamburg, and Bremen, had been reduced from 42 cents in the early part of the season, first, to 32 cents, and later to 30 cents per 100 pounds.

From this it will be seen that the ship rates on Texas cotton since 1927 have been reduced from an average of 60 cents to an average of 30 and a fraction cents per 100 pounds, or about \$1.50 per bale, of which the Texas cotton farmer is entitled to receive the benefits.

Ship officers and experts have informed Congressman MANSFIELD that these rates would not have been possible but for the splendid condition in which our Texas ports have been placed in the past few years, which has greatly reduced the overhead cost in handling such freights. The excellent condition of these ports is now a great asset to the farmers of Texas, and without the improvements that have been made it would now cost \$1.50 per bale more for export cotton to reach its markets.

This is extremely important because it is admitted that the price which cotton brings in foreign markets determines the price which the farmer receives for his cotton in the markets of the United States. Therefore, the less transportation costs the more the farmer should receive for his cotton.

I am inserting this information in this address to show that waterway and port development is not only important to everyone in Jefferson and Orange Counties, but also to the farmers of my district and the State of Texas.

Sufficient appropriation for river and harbor work is also important as a means of furnishing employment to many thousands of American citizens. The Engineering Department and those in a position to know estimate that 90 per cent of the appropriations for river and harbor work goes directly and indirectly to labor. This statement has been made several times this afternoon on the floor of this House, and it has never been challenged. I am opposed to any effort made in the name of economy to decrease appropriations for public works that will furnish employment to many of our citizens, and I hope this amendment will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the merits of this amendment have been discussed pro and con. I rise to call the attention of the committee to the effect of the amendment if adopted, and also to what I understand actuated the subcommittee and also the Committee on Appropriations in reporting the Budget estimates for rivers and harbors and flood control exactly as they were submitted. As has been stated by the Chief of Engineers and the War Department, the original sum asked for was \$75,000,000, and that sum was reduced by the Budget to \$60,000,000. The Chief of Engineers, General Brown, stated to the committee that he

could use all of the \$75,000,000 upon existing projects; that that amount is needed in carrying on those projects. Mr. Chairman, there is no public work which gives as much employment to labor in proportion to the amount expended as work done in river and harbor improvement. The committee, believing that it could reduce the bill and reduce the estimates of military nonessentials for next year by over \$24,000,000, felt that in the interest of labor and employment it ought to appropriate the full amount estimated for this public work. They tell me that down there in the Mississippi Delta colored labor and other labor is receiving as low an amount as 90 cents a day, a miserably small sum.

It is a ridiculously small wage for this work, but I want to tell you in this day it is keeping body and soul together. Yet we are asked here to cut \$6,000,000 from this particular appropriation because certain Members of this House are anxious to economize on this in order to justify more than \$2,000,000 which was voted the other day to pay reserve officers during the 15 days they are in camp. I do not say that my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] is actuated by that purpose, because the gentleman is a genuine economist upon our committee and one of its ablest members, and I am sure he was actuated only by the reasons expressed by him.

Additions have been made to this bill. We will have a record vote on them after a while, and we will see just where we all stand. [Applause.] This bill has been increased \$6,000,000, and now it is proposed to save that money, which was added in order to provide for reserve officers' pay for 15 days in the summer months and to provide for training camps, by cutting out this appropriation which is in the interest of labor.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not yield now. I am sorry.

It has been stated that we will be called upon to vote millions and perhaps billions of dollars for employment of labor before the Congress adjourns. Something must be done. Some steps must be taken to provide for those who are walking the streets to-day seeking jobs which do not exist. Something must be done to enable the men, women, and children who are without positions to live during the coming winter months. Shall we sacrifice those who would receive employment under this appropriation merely to give somebody pay, to provide summer camps during the summer time, when it does not affect the efficiency of our Army or in any way interfere with the national defense? We will be called upon directly to vote upon these amendments, which were added to this bill at the instance of my good friend from California, Mr. BARBOUR. Nearly all of you gentlemen upon the Republican side, with some few exceptions, joined by some of the Democrats, voted to adopt those amendments. Your President asked you to keep this bill within the \$24,000,000 reduction recommended by the committee. Will you keep it within the \$24,000,000, the reduction authorized by the committee, by doing so at the sacrifice of these needy people who are working upon these rivers and harbors, or will you do it in the interest of those who do not need it? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose both amendments. I think no wiser appropriations are made by Congress than those to improve our rivers and harbors. I am only sorry that I am to be denied the privilege of voting for \$75,000,000, the original estimates, instead of the \$60,000,000 carried in this bill. I extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the speech of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH].

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H. DIETERICH, OF ILLINOIS, NOVEMBER 9, 1931, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CIVIL LEGION

I am grateful for being accorded the privilege of addressing this gathering on this occasion.

Any citizen may take just pride in having been associated with this group of patriotic men and women who so unselfishly rendered service to this Nation when we were taking our part in a war the magnitude of which was unprecedented in all history.

The United States Civil Legion is composed of those citizens who gave their time, their talents, and their energies to the winning of that war.

It represents that group of the citizenship who constituted the great administrative forces of the Republic at a time when the man power and the resources of the Nation were being mobilized in the defense of the principles of democracy. It represents those citizens who protected our Army when our Army was protecting our Nation.

It represents those citizens who were defending the principles of representative government at home and in the civil forums of the nations of the world while the soldiers were defending those principles upon the field of battle.

It is made up of those citizens who established the standards of patriotism necessary to prepare the national mind and the national conscience for the greatest sacrifice that this country had ever been called upon to make.

President Wilson in one of his messages very truly said, "It is not an army that we must shape and train for war, it is a nation."

It was agreeable to the sentiment expressed in this statement that the Nation mobilized its talented and experienced citizenship and conducted an educational campaign teaching the lessons of loyalty, economy, courage, and patriotism.

They taught the lessons of patriotism from every rostrum in this land. They strangled disloyalty whenever and wherever it raised its treasonable voice. They taught wealth to forget extravagance and waste. They taught the idle and the indolent the lessons of industry. They taught the civilian to be frugal at home so that our soldiers and sailors would have those things necessary to sustain them in the struggle.

It is a rare treasure to be able to have a memory picture of that vast civilian army, composed of every trade and profession, of every political affiliation and religious persuasion, all working as a harmonious whole, exerting every energy to help carry the American flag, emblematic of liberty and justice to victory.

It is most gratifying when we recall how that army of organized civilians subordinated every personal or selfish interest and devoted themselves to the service of their country and carried forward the multiplicity of activities necessary to our triumph in that conflict.

When the matter of organizing our forces was engaging the attention of the Government the President gave utterance to the following timely advice: "The Nation needs all men, but it needs each man, not in the field which will most please him, but in the endeavor that will best serve the common good. The whole Nation must be a team in which each man shall play the part for which he is best fitted."

Acting upon this advice we conceived and carried into effect the most just method of selecting those who were to serve in the various departments of both the civil and the military establishments that had ever been adopted by any nation of the earth, a method in which age, health, education, intelligence, and present employment determined the service to which the citizen was to be assigned, a method under which wealth was not in favor nor poverty at a disadvantage.

They invoiced every man of military age and, beginning with the age best adapted to military service, they placed each man in the branch of the service in which from physical fitness, mentality, experience, and training he was best suited.

In order to provide the necessary finances, including financial aid to those nations that fate had made our allies, the forging of the engines and the instrumentalities of war, enlarging our Navy, provisioning, clothing, equipping, and transporting our Army and training and equipping our air forces, they adopted the patriotic idea of the Government borrowing the money from our own people.

They directed the loan drives among the citizenship with the result that of the five requests made by the Federal Government in the short space of two years for loans aggregating \$18,500,000,000 our people responded by offering to loan to their government \$24,000,000,000.

It would take more time than would be reasonable for me to occupy to recount even in a general way the achievement of those civilians who so nobly measured up to those many important responsibilities.

There were organizations which were associated in this work and which rendered signal service which still carry on. Among those most active were the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare League, and the Young Men's Christian Association. They constitute permanent bodies that are still active in their various lines of endeavors and to the members of those organizations who are eligible for membership in the United States Civil Legion the matter of associating with us might not occur to them as being urgent.

The greater majority, however, of the various war-time organizations which constituted that civilian army which we are remobilizing ceased when the activities of the war were ended.

The war governors, the war-time Members of the National Congress, the war-time members of the various State legislatures, those in charge of the selective service administration, the department of publicity, the Liberty loan committees, the councils of defense, the reserve militia, the Coast Guards, and the numerous boards and commissions in charge of the different activities who labored together and shared the responsibilities of carrying forward this great work must necessarily still have a sentiment to keep fresh the memories of those accomplishments and an urgent desire to renew their war-time associations.

It would be a tragedy indeed if after their dismissal from the service the work they did should be thrust aside as of little moment and the opportunity should not be given for them to reassociate themselves.

The American service men most rightfully refused to let their mustering out of the service cause them to forget their comrades in arms and the memories of dangers past, and that their close relationship might continue and for their mutual help they organized their various ex-service men's organizations.

The United States Civil Legion, composed of those citizens who during the war time gave support to the soldier and upheld the Government, purposes to continue to uphold the Government and support the ex-service man in his postwar problems.

There are no citizens who better understand the circumstances, the conditions, and the surroundings of those who were selected for military service—there is no one in a better position to correctly estimate the sacrifice that the soldier made—than the members of this organization.

It should certainly be a source of consolation for the World War veteran to know that the citizens who understand his problems best still have a sincere interest in seeing that what he did shall not be forgotten and that justice shall be done by him and the widow and orphan of his comrades who are no more.

It is the moral duty of the members of the United States Civil Legion to see that the boys who were disabled in service receive proper care, that they are justly compensated for their injuries, that those who have since become afflicted are not permitted to suffer for the necessities of life, and that adequate hospitalization is provided for these as well as all other disabled veterans.

The moral duty rests with this organization to see that those who were widowed by this war are provided with the comforts and necessities of life.

The duty rests with us to see that those who were orphaned by this war are given proper care, that they receive proper training for some suitable vocation so as to enable them to become useful citizens, and that the star of opportunity and hope is kept shining above their pathway.

It is not, however, the war-time associations and the moral obligations to those who served beneath the flag that constitutes the only reason why this civilian army becomes aggressive in the work of reorganization, the need for reassociating this group of citizens is more urgent than the mere matter of exalting a service well done.

Never before in the history of the world has there been a peacetime period during which there existed the unrest and the anxiety and the concealed enmity of one nation for another that exist to-day.

Never in the history of this Nation has there been a peacetime period when there was more needed militant Americanism and patriotic leadership than the present time.

The United States Civil Legion has an important peacetime service to perform. It was organized for definite purposes, among which, in addition to those I have just mentioned, are to help bring about an adequate defense of the United States through support of our armed forces on land and sea and in the air; to furnish the necessary civilian leadership to popularize the peacetime program of our national-defense forces; and, finally, to become an organized soldiery of citizenship to work for the advancement of America and to protect the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy as conceived by the American founders.

Upon these purposes I ask your indulgence while I make some observations.

This Nation is not militaristic by tradition or disposition. We have never waged a war of conquest; we have only resorted to arms in defense of the liberties of our people when the righteousness of our cause justified the unsheathing of the sword.

During the early periods of our national existence when our citizenship was busy subduing the wildernesses and developing our natural resources, when our own people were consuming most of our manufactured products, and when our prosperity was not dependent upon our commerce with other nations not much significance was attached to the strength of our Navy or the efficiency of our Military Establishment.

Military training during the early periods of our national existence was not necessary to teach our citizens the use of firearms. The fowling piece was a household necessity and the boy became familiar with the use of the rifle long before he arrived at the military age.

We felt secure in our own protection, we rested content in our knowledge of the patriotic zeal of our people and their willingness to respond to their Nation's call.

We had demonstrated to our satisfaction time and again that the citizen soldier of America was superior to the fighting man of any other age or nation.

This was first demonstrated when the Colonial citizenship took up arms in the War of Independence.

It was demonstrated at New Orleans when a few regiments of Kentucky and Tennessee riflemen defeated a trained British army commanded by one of the ablest generals of his time, in which memorable battle they defeated the army that afterward crossed the seas and destroyed the army of Napoleon on the field of Waterloo.

It was demonstrated in the war with Mexico when we settled the rights of the once Republic of Texas with reference to the international boundary line.

It was demonstrated when the armies of the North and the South faced each other on a hundred battle fields.

It was demonstrated when that great volunteer army offered its services and forever put an end to the Castilian cruelty in the Antilles.

It was conclusively demonstrated to the world when the citizen soldier took his place in the battle lines of Europe and turned defeat into victory and won a war that had been lost.

The wildernesses have been turned into populous States; there is no longer a golden West to allure and give activity to the ever-increasing population. The natural resources of our country have not only been developed but some have already been exploited; many a change has taken place in our national life, and some of these changes are just cause for alarm; the new world has passed into the old.

A land of contentment and plenty has changed to a land where overproduction and unemployment are the problems of the day, where extravagance and want dwell side by side.

Internationalism has taken the place of Pan-Americanism and the money gleaned from the industries and resources of our Nation has been invested in the industrial securities of other lands. These investments have grown to such proportions that a depression in Europe not only reflects itself but rocks the very foundations of the business structures of this Nation.

These investments have grown to the extent that it will take true patriotism, honest and wise judgment, and a decade of time to disentangle us from the web in which these unwise and unpatriotic speculations have enmeshed us.

When the World War was over, the winning of which was made possible only by throwing the flower of American manhood and the unbounded resources of the American Nation into the scales when the balance was unmistakably in favor of the central powers, we neither asked nor received a rood nor a farthing in reimbursement of the many billions of dollars expended and the many lives that were lost while the other allied nations demanded and received the national obligations of the vanquished foe for full reparations.

In the meantime we had loaned to our Allies various amounts aggregating over \$14,000,000,000 to enable them to defray their necessary expenses in the prosecution of the war, for which amounts they issued to us their national obligations.

These loans were provided from the money loaned to our Government by our citizenship and upon which our Government paid a fair rate of interest; these interest payments were made from the taxes levied upon our people and our industries.

The nations of Europe have busied themselves ever since the war closed not in paying but in negotiating reductions in their indebtedness to us through the game of diplomacy; and they have succeeded in having us, without any visible consideration, make such reduction on interest as has netted them a savings of several billions of dollars and increased the burden of our own people to that amount.

They now tell us that we will be enriched by giving some fifteen thousand millions of dollars of our people's money to the nations of Europe. That such action is necessary to produce a friendly understanding to promote prosperity and achieve permanent peace.

Let us ever remember that nations are not unlike individuals in their dispositions and dealings. Selfishness, greed, and avarice are the characteristics of some nations as well as of some men.

Let us ever bear in mind that the disposition to evade obligations when obligations become burdensome, the disposition to profit by the transaction, and the temptation to be unfair in order to profit are national weaknesses as well as the weakness of individuals.

Laying aside all this and accrediting every motive with purity of purpose, let us never forget that the sense of obligation will not necessarily be present in the governments and the citizenship of to-morrow to repay the favors and the sacrifices that we make to-day. A draft made by our children on the bank of European friendship may not be honored.

Along with the propaganda of the forgiveness of obligations under the appellation of "moratoriums," "holidays," "postponements," and other soothing terms, all springing from the mother-word "cancellation," which word the people have come to understand and for which reason its use is carefully avoided, comes the peace propaganda for the reduction of armament and the opposition to appropriations for the national defense.

Our longing for peace will not justify this Nation in neglecting to prepare for her necessary defense against possible invasion or conducting offensive warfare in case our liberties are challenged, our national honor prostituted, or our national obligations wilfully and deliberately ignored.

The nation which allows the sentiment of peace at any price to influence its course of dealing becomes a degraded coward, forfeits its respect, surrenders its obligations, and in the end allows the liberty of the citizen to be destroyed.

There are some things worse than war. We can sometimes pay too great a price for peace, but we can never pay too high a price for maintaining our national honor, our national principles, and our national traditions.

Our traditions and history in which every call to arms has been a call in defense of humanity, our generosity in victory, our national disposition to peace, our aid to suffering humanity extended to every clime and every creed, and our love of the principles of human liberty are so well known that no civilized nation need fear injustice at our hands.

We have no people to oppress, no possessions to hold in forced subjugation, no neighbor toward which we cherish a feeling of

hatred, no past wrongs inflicted against us as a nation or against our people concerning which we keep the fires of vengeance burning, no desire to hold dominion over any people, and no desire to profit except in the legitimate channels of peaceful enterprise.

So long as the militaristic nations of the world maintain naval bases along the coasts of the continents of America and maintain such navies as they consider necessary to protect them in their possessions and their commerce, the United States should maintain a navy of like adequacy in both defensive and offensive warfare, that adequacy not to be determined by a comparison of ships, guns, or tonnage with any other nation.

No authority on earth has the right to dictate the armament of a nation when such armament has never been employed except in the cause of justice and in defense of humanity.

No earthly power has the right to tell the nation to lower the range of her guns when those guns have never fired a shot except against injustice, oppression, and tyranny.

America standing as she has always stood upon the principles of justice and liberty for all owes it to her people to maintain a standing army equal to meet any emergency until her citizenship can be mobilized, and to provide sufficient and effective equipment to defend against any possible invasion until her manufacturing industries can be converted from their present production to the production of the arms and munitions of war.

Large standing armies do not necessarily spell preparedness, but a trained citizenship possessing a general knowledge of military duties does.

The institution that to-day more correctly represents our idea of military preparedness is the Reserve Officers' Training Corps established by various acts of Congress during and since the World War by which proper military training is given to those citizens qualified for that service enabling us in the event it should ever again become necessary to call our people to arms to have the necessary trained citizens to organize and discipline our armies.

This organization can do no more useful work than to lend its aid and encouragement to the establishment, the continuation and the enlargement of these activities.

Every decade of our history brings to military age over 5,000,000 of the young manhood of this country, and we can render a useful service to the cause of liberty by teaching that young manhood of America the necessity of taking a reasonable course of military training, by seeing that the training camps are adequately supplied with the latest approved equipment in arms and other instrumentalities useful in battle, and that proper instruction is given in military tactics and in the use of arms and the engines of war.

It was the pernicious propaganda that America was unwilling and unequipped for war more than any other factor that ultimately brought us into the world conflict.

Military preparedness is just as potent for the promotion of peace as it is for the winning of wars.

No more beautiful sentiment could animate any group of people than that purpose of this organization contained in the statement "to become an organized soldiery of citizenship to protect the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy as conceived by the American founders."

This means that in order to accomplish this, adherence to principle must be placed above partisanship.

Political parties were not contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, but it soon became apparent to the observing that such groups might be formed.

Washington did not approve of the formation of political groups or parties and forewarned us of the mischief that would result in case this course was adopted by our people. He knew their tendency to promote the interest of some particular section or some particular group without regard to the interest of the people as a whole through organizations of this kind.

He also foresaw that designing nations not friendly to our Government or its institutions could exert their influences through party channels. In his Farewell Address he sounded the prophetic warning that "It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passion. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another."

We can not, however, undo the past, and to-day political parties constitute or should constitute the agencies by which the will of the people finds expression in the policies of government, and this is the avenue through which we must work to carry out the object I have just mentioned of protecting the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy as conceived by the American founders.

This group of men constituting the United States Civil Legion who were big enough to lay aside party and creed and join in working for a common cause in a national crisis during the period of war are certainly big enough to do the same in a national crisis during a period of peace.

They can do much toward its accomplishment by discouraging unjust criticism and unwarranted exaggeration as well as discouraging the more harmful practices of deliberately refusing or willfully falsifying facts gathered by officials in their official capacities pertaining to matters concerning which the people have the right to be informed in order to shape their action or cast an intelligent ballot.

They can accomplish much by insisting that integrity mark political action and political utterances for if we are to be gov-

erned by parties, then the parties are necessarily the pillars of the Government and the Government constitutes the superstructure and the superstructure can remain stable only as the pillars give strength to its support. If the pillars fall, it necessarily follows that the superstructure must also fall.

History tells us that the rise of anarchy, during the period after the ending of the Revolution and before the adoption of the Constitution, ceased as soon as the people began to understand the Constitution; that with that understanding grew a wholesome respect for that organic law and a patriotic willingness to submit to the Government outlined therein.

That Constitution was written in simple language; the people had no difficulty in acquainting themselves with its provisions, and it met with their entire approval. But that Constitution that the people thought they understood has been changed and departed from until the citizen no longer professes to know its meaning, and his confidence in the basic law of his country has been shaken, if not destroyed.

No citizen who has a reasonable knowledge of the English language can fail to understand what was intended by the last of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which provided that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." The citizen is somewhat mystified when in the face of this provision he sees the Federal Government exercise arbitrary power in the regulation and control of all matters, police and otherwise, pertaining to the States of the Union as well as their people.

Washington in his Farewell Address stressed the importance of following the Constitution as adopted by the convention and not permitting encroachment of one department of the Federal Government upon that of another and the keeping of those departments separate so that they can act as checks and safeguards to each other.

This advice of the Father of our Country has also been disregarded. Little by little has one department encroached upon the other and taken to itself the exercise of functions belonging to the other. Little by little the executive forced the legislative into passing such laws as would meet the executive idea and little by little have the legislative and executive coerced the judicial in placing its stamp of approval on the constitutionality of laws that were passed for partisan purposes and political expediency.

The judicial department of our Federal Government which was supposed to be the department to determine the rights of the citizen, whenever controverted questions arose, has gradually, following one pretext or another, been disrobed of many of its judicial functions. To-day we have the spectacle of unskilled political appointees judicially determining the rights of citizenship in the revenue and other departments of the Federal Government, with the only redress left to the citizens to appeal from one appointee to another, with the road that finally leads to a determination of his rights by the judicial department of his Government so difficult, technical, and expensive that it is more economical for the citizen to surrender his rights than to attempt to obtain a remedy.

All these things have had a tendency to create a disrespect by the citizen for his Government and all have been brought about by reason of the fact that the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy as conceived by the American founders have not been properly safeguarded.

So in order to bring about, in an orderly way, without disturbance, without bitterness, using reason as our only weapon of warfare, the accomplishment of the purposes of our order, the civil legion begins a militant crusade.

It tenders the services of its membership to the ex-service men to help achieve the objects for which they are striving. It offers its energies for military preparedness in every department of the military service.

It consecrates itself to the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy as conceived by the American founders.

And finally, it pledges the lives and fortunes of its membership to resist any attempt to change the form of the constitutional Government established by the fathers and substitute in the place thereof the uncertain and unstable and dangerous ideas of communism.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

In view of the fact that the debate on this amendment has been lengthy, the Clerk will, without objection, report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE].

There was no objection.

The amendments were again reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 54 and noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 33, sec. 702a), \$31,773,775.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: On page 73, in line 8, after the figure "\$31,773,775," insert "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment of wages except such as are determined and paid in accordance with Public Act No. 798, Seventy-first Congress."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. COLLINS. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is a negative restriction upon the appropriation, and for that reason is a limitation and would be in order. Unless the gentleman from Mississippi desires to be heard further, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, may the amendment be again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. Goss.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is this not already existing law?

Mr. GOSS. No. I am sorry to say there is an exception made with regard to flood control. I understand the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has that matter under consideration now and we are hopeful that that committee may bring it out so that it will become law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not being considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GOSS. By the Committee on Flood Control. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. There is no legislation of that kind pending before the Committee on Flood Control.

Mr. GOSS. I have been informed that there was.

Mr. KELLER. It is before the Committee on Labor.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that if this amendment is adopted, the old so-called Davis-Bacon wage bill, Public Act No. 798, will take effect on the contracts in the Mississippi flood-control area.

I have been informed that many of the workmen have been paid as low as 90 cents per day on this type of work.

The plea was made on the previous amount we just kept in the bill for rivers and harbors work and also for flood control, that it was needed to keep people employed. Now, I say in all fairness, if that is what is in the minds of those who have spoken in behalf of this legislation, Congress should see to it they are paid a fair wage, and a fair wage as determined by this public act. Why rivers and harbors work and flood control are immune from this particular public act I have not been able to find out, and I hope the Committee on Labor will report that bill some time this session, because there is no good reason why this particular work should be exempted from its provisions.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. I have listened to the gentleman very carefully. What is his purpose? What does he seek to do?

Mr. GOSS. I am simply advocating in this amendment the application to rivers and harbors and flood-control work the Davis-Bacon wage bill, Public Act No. 798.

Mr. PARKS. What is it?

Mr. GOSS. I will read it to the gentleman if he wants to know. I am surprised the gentleman is not familiar with it.

Mr. PARKS. No; not at all, but I doubt if the gentleman is familiar with it because he can not tell me what it is.

Mr. GOSS. I will read it to you:

Be it enacted, etc., That every contract in excess of \$5,000 in amount, to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party, which requires or involves the employment of laborers or mechanics in the construction, alteration, and/or repair of any public buildings of the United States or the District of Columbia within the geographical limits of the States of the Union or the District of Columbia, shall contain a provision to the effect that the rate of wage for all laborers and mechanics employed by the contractor or any subcontractor on the public buildings covered by the contract shall be not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work of a similar nature in the city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the public buildings are located, or in the District of Columbia if the public buildings are located there, and a further provision that in case any dispute arises as to what are the prevailing rates of wages for work of a similar nature applicable to the contract which can not be adjusted by the contracting officer, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of Labor for determination and his decision thereon shall be conclusive on all parties to the contract: *Provided*, That in case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this act.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after its passage but shall not affect any contract then existing or any contract that may thereafter be entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the passage of this act.

Now, I submit the House, in all fairness, should adopt this amendment, because if we are going to provide money in the bill to relieve unemployment let us relieve unemployment with a living wage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose the gentleman is trying to accomplish, but it can not be accomplished through attaching the Davis-Bacon bill to the appropriation bill.

The truth is the Labor Committee has for months had under consideration the very question the gentleman has been discussing.

The Davis-Bacon bill directs the Secretary of Labor to determine, wherever there is a dispute, what the prevailing wage scale is in the community where the work is being done. The Labor Committee has found through hearings that were that law applied to rivers and harbor work and to flood-control work it would be necessary to fix a scale of wages below even the low scale now being paid. Therefore, the committee has reported a bill, which is on the calendar, known as the Connery bill, which does attempt to fix a living scale of wages for this class of work. In addition, the Senate has passed the Metcalf bill, which takes in public works of all kinds and would do exactly what the gentleman from Connecticut seeks to do by his amendment.

Those who come from the territory where this work is being done know that the prevailing scale of wages in those communities is the farm-labor wages, which are below even the scale being paid now by some unfair contractors. I think we ought to have legislation to make them pay a decent rate of wages. I am just as much in favor of it as anybody can be, but if we apply the provisions of the Davis-Bacon bill to this work, the only thing the Secretary of Labor could do would be to fix the farm-labor wages as the wages to be paid for this work, and they would be even below the scale of wages now being paid by the contractors.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not better policy to settle this by legislation rather than by an amendment on an appropriation bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think so, unquestionably; and I think the Committee on Labor will probably report out the Metcalf bill or something similar which will take care of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would apply to laborers engaged on flood-control work; and I want to emphasize again I am very fearful that instead of accomplishing the purpose the gentleman desires, with which I sympathize, it would result in making it absolutely necessary, under the law, to fix a lower scale of wages than is now being paid.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. I suggest to the gentleman the Davis-Bacon law says the wages to be paid shall be wages for work of a similar nature—not farm labor, but for the same kind of labor that is being done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. But this is common labor, and the only prevailing wage scale in the areas where flood-control work is being carried on is for common labor on the farms.

I am very fearful that the amendment, if adopted, will have the opposite effect from that which the gentleman hopes to accomplish.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McGUGIN. Will the Chairman permit me to ask a question before the motion is put?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McGUGIN. I want to offer an amendment to reduce the appropriation. That is a very vital part of this section. Does the chairman of the subcommittee want to shut me off and deny me the opportunity to do that?

Mr. COLLINS. No; I do not wish to deny the gentleman the opportunity of offering an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out "5 minutes" and insert in lieu thereof "20 minutes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment to the motion was rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to show you exactly where the proposal of our friend from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] leads. There is being spent right now in Washington, the Nation's Capital, millions of dollars of public money on construction work. If you will get the Washington Post of this morning, you will find therein that the master builders of Washington have reported to the carpenters that they can not pay over \$9 under present circumstances. When you remember what our friend from Tennessee said—that on rivers and harbors work many laborers are getting 90 cents a day—the carpenters of Washington, from public money, ought to be glad to get \$9 a day, and yet when it was put up to a vote they turned it down almost unanimously, and they insisted on \$11 a day. The master builders first offered \$8 per day, which was turned down, and they came back yesterday with a proposal to compromise the matter, making it \$9 a day. If you will look in this morning's Post you will find the following:

CARPENTERS REJECT \$9 PER DIEM SCALE—THREATEN TO WITHDRAW MEN FROM JOB IF BUILDERS CUT WITHOUT CONSENT

The second wage referendum submitted in two weeks to the Carpenters' District Council last night resulted in rejection of the proposal of the Master Builders Association to cut wages.

The original proposal of the builders was to reduce the \$11 per day wage scale to \$8 per day. This proposal was rejected with a vote of 12 to 1, and construction operations paying less than the union scale were "locked out" by the carpenters. About 40 men were removed from work, according to L. H. Hardison, president of the council.

A compromise offer of a \$9 per day scale was submitted by the builders. At the meeting last night at Masonic Auditorium 846 ballots were cast and only 225 carpenters were willing to accept the reduced scale. Hardison said the council was open to any other offers proposed by the contracting group, but that any attempt to cut the union wage without the consent of the carpenters would result in the removal of the men from the job.

So you see that the 846 carpenters here, who are reveling in desirable Government work and receiving high wages

from public moneys, turned it down and said they would not accept \$9, and they are demanding \$11 a day, which is beyond the price that is paid for carpenters in every city of the United States except Washington. So my friend from Connecticut will see just where it leads.

Is he insisting that the carpenters of Washington should turn down a \$9 per day proposal like that and insist on receiving \$11 a day, when his carpenters up in Connecticut are not receiving any such sum?

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. I do not know anything about the carpenters here in Washington, but it has been admitted that in Mississippi and in the gentleman's section, laborers receive 80 cents and 90 cents a day. That is far too low.

Mr. BLANTON. Not in my section, if you please. None of the money is spent in my section. There is no such public work done in my section, but there is work done in Connecticut and paid for by Connecticut people.

Mr. GOSS. Not at 90 cents a day, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. No; but no carpenter in Connecticut now receives \$11 a day, I will say to my friend, while 846 Washington carpenters receive \$11 per day from Government money.

It is just such laws as my friend is proposing here that permit the carpenters of Washington to stand up and say they will not take \$9 a day, but demand \$11 a day, when 7,000,000 men elsewhere are starving to death and can not get a job for \$1 a day.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The reason why the Davis-Bacon Act was enacted was because your southern contractors bid in competition with northern contractors paying a living wage, and they based their bids on their 90 cent and \$1 a day labor.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to my friend from Wisconsin and my friend from Connecticut that in the city of Dallas, which is one of the leading cities of my State, contractors are paying as high wages as will be found to be paid in any city of the United States except Washington. They always pay the highest wages in the world down there. In Galveston, Tex., the home of my good friend CLAY BRIGGS; in Houston, where I was born; in Fort Worth, the home of our friend, Mr. LANHAM; and in San Antonio, the city of my friend, Mr. KLEBERG, they pay as high wages as are paid anywhere in the country except in Washington. You talk about southern contractors. They are paying their men as high wages as you will find in any city in Wisconsin or in Connecticut. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] ought to get away from Milwaukee some time. He ought to get away from this 1-road track from here to Milwaukee. He ought to come down to Texas and see what progressive people are. He would find that there are more progressive cities in my district in western Texas than he has in the entire State of Wisconsin.

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman is for a high wage scale, he ought to be for the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGUGIN: Page 73, in line 8, strike out the sign and figures "\$31,773,775" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$26,773,775."

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a reduction of \$5,000,000 in this appropriation. For more than a week I have been in the House listening to the debate pertaining to this bill. Everyone realizes we must have some economies

in the operation of government. Here we have the military bill, a bill pertaining to the Army, but where does the reduction come in? Does it come in on the pork-barrel part of the Army bill or does it come in on the national-defense part of the Army bill? The amendments up to date have been to endeavor to restore to this bill that part which is taken out of it pertaining to the national defense. The committee accepted the Budget Director's report on the pork-barrel part of this bill, but when it comes to the national-defense part of this bill there is where the committee makes the reduction. [Applause.]

Under the Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, and I say to you in all fairness and in all candor it is a dangerous policy for you and me to undertake to sit here on the floor of the House and repudiate and ignore the advice of the Commander in Chief of the Army in the matter of national defense. Yet we do it, for what? In order to try to save our faces for our extravagance in this session of Congress and to try to excuse ourselves before the country for not reducing the expenses of government.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McGUGIN. Not at this moment. I shall yield to the gentleman later.

Then, when we come to this bill, the report of the Budget Director is good enough on the pork-barrel items but is not good enough on national defense.

A great deal has been said here about what the President wants in connection with national defense. In his statement of March 26 he had this to say:

We should not further reduce the strength of our national defense.

There is the President's statement, and it is not subject to any misunderstanding or any argument between two Members of the Congress. On March 26 he said we should not reduce our national defense; and now when I see this Congress and this committee refusing to reduce the pork-barrel part of this bill—the grab part of it—in which your constituents are interested, then is when I turn face about and here and now say that when the roll call comes to-day, I am going to vote for the Barbour amendments. [Applause.]

I am not going to give up the defense of my country when you are not willing to give up the pork barrel, if you please. [Applause.] You know it is pork. You know the rivers and harbors item is pork, and every man in the United States knows it is primarily pork. A good part of your flood relief is pork, and we know it is going to be the means for contractors to steal from the Government and rob slave labor.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. Yes; I yield now to my good friend from Alabama.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I thank the gentleman. It was indicated here by two reputable gentlemen that the President said he expected this bill to leave this House with certain cuts in the appropriations.

Mr. McGUGIN. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Where are those cuts going to be made?

Mr. McGUGIN. In the pork barrel, if I can have my way about it. [Applause.] In flood control, as you call it here, and in rivers and harbors; and that is where the President wants it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Has the President said so?

Mr. McGUGIN. That is his public statement of March 26.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But the President has not said so. If that is the President's position, we are very glad to know it. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

It is said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN], who has just taken his seat and who has proposed the amendment to reduce the appropriation for flood control on the Mississippi River \$5,000,000, that appropriations for flood control are pork-barrel legislation. The gentleman

evidently spoke hastily. Flood control is a part of the internal improvement of the country, and the leading statesmen of the Nation have always advocated national internal improvements. If promotion of navigation and the protection of lives and property are pork-barrel legislation, my reply is that such legislation is desirable and commendable.

The improvement of the Mississippi River and control of its floods is a national problem. The great flood of 1927, in the language of Herbert Hoover, was the greatest peacetime disaster the Nation has ever known. The flood control act of 1928 was passed as a result of the sacrifices and losses caused by the flood of 1927. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has called attention to the fact that the President of the United States advocates river and harbor work in aid of unemployment. Whom will my friends on the Republican side follow, the President of the United States or the gentleman from Kansas? As the gentleman from New York pointed out, President Hoover was so exceedingly desirous of fostering river and harbor work that he sent a special message to Congress on March 14, 1932, requesting Congress to make appropriations for this work immediately available. I quote from the message:

I therefore recommend that the Congress give consideration to immediate appropriation of the funds for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works in order that we may avoid the unemployment and dislocation which will arise from such delays. Such a course would imply no increase in the contemplated expenditures.

There was attached to the message of the President a report from the Director of the Budget. This report contained the views of the Secretary of War with respect to river and harbor work. I quote from the statement of the Secretary of War:

It was considered in the public interest to press the work during the past winter season in the interest of the unemployment situation and to advance the work under present favorable conditions of prices.

In the matter of flood control it is quite evident that both the President and the Secretary of War are in absolute accord. Who is right, the President of the United States, who advocates river and harbor work in aid of unemployment, or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN], who speaks derisively of flood control as pork-barrel legislation? In the matter of river and harbor work and flood-control improvement I prefer to follow the recommendations of the President of the United States rather than the half-baked and ill-considered views of the gentleman from Kansas. [Applause.]

Pork-barrel legislation involves the passage of legislation in many cases without consideration of the merits involved. Such is not the case with legislation for the flood control of the Mississippi River.

The flood control act of 1928 authorized the appropriation of \$325,000,000 for flood-control works in the lower Mississippi River. No other project was under consideration. The case was considered upon the merits of flood control on the Mississippi River. There was no opportunity for pork-barrel legislation. The act was passed after the most careful studies and exhaustive hearings ever held by a committee of Congress. The gentleman from Kansas, in speaking of flood control on the Mississippi River as pork-barrel legislation, betrays an utter unfamiliarity with the subject. The flood control act passed both the Senate and the House by practically a unanimous vote. It was approved by President Calvin Coolidge, who always stood for economy.

In times past pork-barrel legislation has been applied to river and harbor legislation. The gentleman from Kansas, in referring to flood control along the lower Mississippi River as pork-barrel legislation, is evidently not familiar with the history, progress, and problem of flood control, as provided by the act of May 15, 1928. The adoption of his amendment to reduce the annual appropriation by \$5,000,000 would not defeat flood control. It would merely postpone the appropriation and delay the completion of the project. It would take legislation to change the existing law, which provides for the control of the floods in the lower Mississippi

Valley. The gentleman's arguments for economy are just about as applicable as his arguments in opposition to flood control.

Pork-barrel legislation involves a multitude of projects, some of which can not stand on their own merits. Such is not the case with flood control along the lower Mississippi River. It constitutes the greatest single internal improvement project ever undertaken by the Government. It was considered and as an independent proposition was passed almost unanimously by Congress. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] evidently spoke without giving the subject his usual careful thought. On reflection, I feel sure that he will not again characterize flood control along the Mississippi River as pork-barrel legislation. The Middle West is interested in the improvement of the lower Mississippi River for navigation to reduce freight rates, and flood control is essential in all projects for navigation.

I maintain that reduction in the appropriation for Mississippi flood control would not only be false economy but would be a dangerous policy. I oppose the amendment for the following perfectly manifest reasons:

First. The Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Lytle Brown, recommended \$35,000,000 for Mississippi flood control for the next fiscal year. The Director of the Budget reduced the amount requested to \$32,000,000. The Appropriations Committee followed the Budget, and the bill carries \$32,000,000 for flood control. We are now asked as a matter of economy to reduce the annual appropriation. Such reduction would be false economy and would probably cost the Government more in the future than might be saved at present. There is no economy in fact, for a reduction in the appropriation is merely a postponement. It means delay in flood-control protection.

Second. The pending bill carries a reduction of 10 per cent from the previous annual appropriation. A further reduction by the House would be unjust. If the House singles out flood control and further reduces this item, the probability is that the policy that now obtains in the Senate, and which did obtain in the Interior appropriation bill, would result in a further horizontal reduction of 10 per cent. Flood control would thus be singled out. This internal improvement would be discriminated against. It would be unfair to reduce with a probable further reduction by the Senate.

Third. The adopted project provides for raising, strengthening, and enlarging the main-line levees. The flood danger is ever present. We have the experiences of 1929 in the Greenville, Miss., area in mind. There was the highest water in that area that ever went down the river except the great flood of 1927.

The plan provides not only for a continuously enlarged levee line but it is important that it be completed at the earliest practicable date. If there are openings or incomplete levees, delay may be dangerous. Floods come at intervals. It has been five years since the flood of 1927. There is the greater danger of the greater loss from an overflow. The best economy for both the Government and the people is the immediate completion of the levee line. Instead of delaying the work, instead of reducing the appropriation, now is the appropriate time to speed up the work. No levee line is stronger than its weakest link. There is always the possibility, if not the probability, under the law of averages, of a greater loss from an overflow than the entire costs of levee improvement.

Fourth. In December, 1930, upon the recommendation of President Hoover, Congress appropriated \$3,000,000 for flood control and some \$22,000,000 for rivers and harbors as an emergency measure in aid of unemployment. Labor is the chief beneficiary in flood-control improvement. Just recently, as I have stated, to emphasize the importance of the work the President sent a special message to Congress, asking that funds be made immediately available for river and harbor work in aid of unemployment. Not only does flood-control improvement provide for the protection of the lower Mississippi Valley but it contributes much to the solution of the unemployment situation that now obtains.

Fifth. Some of our friends who now favor a reduction in the appropriation for flood control advocated the emergency highway-construction legislation that passed the House on February 27, 1932. Their advocacy was based upon the plea that highway construction would aid unemployment. My friends are inconsistent in opposing flood control. Flood control not only provides employment, but it contributes to the protection of life and property and aids in improving the Mississippi River for navigation.

Sixth. I summarize by urging Congress not to reduce the appropriation, and I maintain that a reduction might result in a great loss. Much property may be destroyed, and many lives may be sacrificed. Unemployment would increase. The flood control of the lower Mississippi River, which is the greatest navigable river in the United States and the world, would be hindered. Delay would be dangerous. The result might be loss and destruction. There would certainly be no economy either to the people or to the Government. In the name of the people of the Lower Mississippi Valley, whose direct losses in the flood of 1927, according to President Hoover, amounted to \$200,000,000, with indirect losses of \$200,000,000 more, and recalling that 245 people lost their lives and that 700,000 people were driven from their homes in the flood of 1927, I protest against a reduction in the appropriation for flood control. There is no economy in withholding the expenditure of \$1 where \$100 of economic loss might result. Reduction in the appropriation is not only dangerous but incompatible with national economy. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. Strike out "15" and insert "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my amendment and make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was never so startled in my life as when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] talked about reducing this appropriation for flood control, and called it a pork-barrel proposition.

I can not conceive of anybody of his age and presumed intelligence who could not remember the scenes in this House in 1928, and had read in the newspapers about the terrible tragedy, could be induced to offer this kind of an amendment.

Mr. McGUGIN. Does the gentleman think that a reduction of \$5,000,000 will ruin the appropriation?

Mr. REID of Illinois. Yes; I think it would. You might as well take the powder out of the pyrene extinguisher as to take this \$5,000,000 out of the flood-control appropriation.

I will tell you why. We fought these floods for years and finally got the Government to take over the flood control on the lower Mississippi River. Before that time every local district had a flood-control proposition of their own. In one place you had a fine levee, and in the next you had a poor levee, and then in the next place perhaps no levee at all.

This work must proceed rapidly, the work ought to be done all at once if possible, because if the water breaks through in one levee it lets the water in behind, and your entire levee system and the whole line will be destroyed.

The people of the South have paid in \$290,000,000. We have spent nearly \$100,000,000, and are you going to permit, by taking this \$5,000,000 out of this appropriation, a greater danger than we had in 1927?

There were 18,000 square miles flooded. I think \$5,000,000 may be enough to complete some portion of the work that is necessary for the entire work.

Now, anybody that calls a proposition that will save the flooding of 18,000 square miles pork, and the saving of 700,000 peoples' homes pork—I can not understand how anybody can be misled in that way.

The gentleman from Kansas is like the preacher who stated his text, and then went on and forgot it. He offered this amendment, and then went on to talk about something else. Upon the theory that he might have religious scruples about that, I excuse him. Of course, I was not here to vote on these amendments in regard to reserve officers and all that, but I am for them.

Mr. Chairman, economy can be practiced in a right way and in a wrong way. The economy that we want to practice is economy in things not absolutely for the preservation of life and property. This amount of money is absolutely necessary at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What I can not understand is how the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] could plead so eloquently for his river and harbor matters up yonder, and go along with us and appropriate the money, and now fight the legitimate river and harbor appropriations.

Mr. REID of Illinois. I do not think the gentleman from New York did that. This is not pork in any way, and people ought not to be fooled by any such statement.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman state whether or not we use a set amount every year for this purpose?

Mr. REID of Illinois. Yes. In 1931 we appropriated and used \$37,000,000. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] is going to tell you about it, and he will tell you the number of laborers employed. That is not sufficient to complete the work, and we pretty nearly had a flood this time.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman state whether or not we are continuing on a certain line of work all of the time on these levees?

Mr. REID of Illinois. They are raising the levees continually.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID], the former chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, has answered all of the argument about the pork barrel. I think the vote on the amendment to reduce the appropriation for rivers and harbors will certainly satisfy those who are interested in navigation in so far as this particular part of the appropriation is concerned, because when we will have completed the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio and tributaries, on which the Government will have spent over a billion dollars, all of the freight and tonnage to be carried by those rivers will be collected at Cairo, Ill., at the beginning of this flood-control project, to be carried safely along the main channel of the Mississippi River on to the Gulf and on to the markets of the world. One-third of this appropriation goes to improvement for navigation, affecting the most important navigation project in the entire United States. Practical economy would be to avoid unreasonable losses and prevent great disasters. This is emergency work for that purpose. The appropriation that we have in this bill for flood control is to carry on and continue the execution of an emergency project. Of the \$32,000,000 carried in the bill for flood control, the Government pays out to labor that it hires \$14,308,447. That amount carries an average of over 6,000 men in employment on this project from Cape Girardeau to the Gulf all the year around. Of the \$37,000,000 for the fiscal year 1931, \$22,970,679 went to labor, an annual average of 9,000 people being employed. In other words, of this appropriation for flood control, 54 per cent of the entire amount appropriated goes into wages, to maintain employment. The remainder of the appropriation, practically all except overhead, goes into the purchase of material and supplies.

So, if we are interested in continuing and increasing employment and paying wages to labor and for the purchase of supplies from American citizens, we could not vote any

reduction in this appropriation. The flood control act of 1928 authorized \$325,000,000. Including this appropriation, of that amount \$137,000,000 has been provided. The Chief of Engineers testified before the Committee on Appropriations as well as before the Flood Control Committee that although the project on the main channel was outlined to be completed by 1938, with the progress they are making now, getting better contracts, executing the work at a less cost, completion would be obtained by 1935, saving three years on the main feature of the project. That is most important.

If you can avoid disaster which might come from a flood that may occur at any time, costing ten times this appropriation, and if you are hastening the completion of the project under the present organization, you will be saving money. I do not know anything that would be further from economy in a practical way than to reduce the appropriation for flood control on the Mississippi River. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall vote against the amendment offered by the distinguished Republican from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] to reduce a very essential appropriation. We can all remember several years ago when people's lives and homes were being destroyed by reason of an act of God, the terrible floods in the Mississippi Valley, how everyone promised to do what they could to prevent a recurrence of the disaster.

In these days of unemployment in an endeavor to limit the appropriations for this essential work the gentleman from Kansas calls it "pork" perhaps because the money will be expended in some of the Mississippi River States and not in the State of Kansas. What kind of pork was the gentleman from Kansas supporting the other day when he passed between the tellers and voted for \$1,500,000 to fight grasshoppers in the State of Kansas. [Applause.]

I believe that if the Representatives from the States of Kansas and Nebraska can vote in these times of financial distress \$1,500,000 to fight grasshoppers in their States, they can consistently vote sufficient money to provide the necessary works to protect human lives in the Mississippi Valley if another great flood should come upon the people of the Mississippi Valley States. [Applause.] Let us not be facing this way to-day and the other way to-morrow, the way some of these Democratic economy peddlers do. Mr. BYRNS, the gentleman from Tennessee, and the rest of the alleged economy experts, to-day eloquently speak in favor of this bill as a means of furnishing employment to the unemployed. The other day they spoke as eloquently in the name of economy in favor of throwing thousands of additional people into the river of unemployment.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] wondered about the inconsistency of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. When it comes to inconsistency the gentleman from Texas takes the prize. Three weeks ago the gentleman from Texas, in the very well of this House, said that Bishop Cannon was responsible for putting President Hoover in the White House, and only a few days later he said that WILL WOOD put Hoover in the White House.

The gentleman from Texas always talks about economy when he thinks it is well for his political purposes to do so. When the War Department appropriation bill was up he forgot that in time of peace we must maintain an adequate defense to protect the lives of our people and our country in time of war. In time of peace we should also provide sufficient appropriations for flood-control works which are necessary to protect the lives of our citizens from the enemies within, particularly the wild, raging rivers, when they overflow their banks and threaten the destruction of the lives and homes of our people. The Treasury did not topple in 1919 when the Democratic Party increased our national debt to over \$29,600,000,000. The Republicans have reduced that debt to approximately \$18,000,000,000. Let us issue bonds and carry on the necessary public works if these works are opposed because of the condition of the Treasury according to the position taken by the gentleman from Kansas. The building of public works will also assist in relieving the un-

employment which now exists. Many Democratic demagogues on and off the floor of the House condemn the President and the Republican Party for an increase in appropriations for their operation of the Federal Government notwithstanding the fact that the increase to a large extent is the result of spending many millions for rivers and harbors work and for public-building work in your own States. Tear off the camouflage of your economy hypocrisy and get down and face the facts. Do not follow the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], one day facing one way and the next day facing the other. If you are really in favor of economy and in favor of helping that poor, badly battered Treasury and the taxpayers, vote for that beer bill next Monday and get \$500,000,000 into the Treasury each year. [Applause.] There will then be more funds for pork, if you want to call it that, in your dry Southern States, and your people will not be taxed to raise those funds, and you will get the benefits, and you will not have to bleed and die in the name of economy as many of you have done this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be notified when I have consumed two minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am a 2-minute speaker, so it does not hurt to cut my time. I can say enough, in my judgment, in two minutes to defeat this amendment. In company with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID] I went over all of this flood area in the South when it occurred. We flew from Vicksburg down to Simmesport and then across to New Orleans, and we examined every part of that flood area. If you had seen the sights which we saw there would not be anyone from Kansas or any other State who would raise a hand against appropriating money to stop the great floods of the South. When we flew over there we could not see a particle of ground in any place all the way from Vicksburg to Simmesport. All we could see was water. We could hardly find a church steeple. Those poor people had been submerged in that water or moved out or had flown out on account of it. Then Members get up here and call it "pork." I think that is beyond expression. The thing for us to do is to pass this bill as is [applause] and not take a dime away from it, because I am satisfied that some of you who will remain in Congress may find a day when there will be another flood just as bad as that one, and if it is neglected now, when there is an opportunity to build up against it, there will be no one to blame but yourselves.

I sympathize with these men from the South and I am opposed to any amendment to reduce this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about war during the discussion of the bill; and the proponent of the pending amendment has declared his purpose to support the retention of 2,000 officers of the Regular Army for the purpose of properly preparing for the contingency of future war.

Let me admonish you gentlemen that the people in the Mississippi Valley affected by this item are engaged in warfare every day of their lives. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN] may not be aware of conditions there, and the only possible excuse for the proposed reduction that could be given in fairness is to credit him with ignorance of such conditions. In 1927 in that valley 240 lives were lost and \$300,000,000 of property damage was done.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRIVER. I have only three minutes. If you insist, I will.

The gentleman from Illinois gave a statement of the conditions in the valley. If any part of the levee system is weak it means the flooding of the valley below the breach because a few yards of dirt were not thrown at the proper place. It is peculiarly emergency work.

In 1914 the Mississippi River Commission fixed the grade and section for levees on the river. As stated by the gentleman from Alabama, the work ceased during the war;

nothing was done during that time except a little maintenance work by people locally. Therefore it was not until 1920 that work was resumed, and we were unable to build to the specified grade and section in the limited time before the great flood of 1927 was precipitated upon the valley. The only sections of the valley that were protected in lives and property were the sections that were so able to build to the engineers' fixed grade and section, and one-third was saved in this way.

We do not know three months in advance when this army is going to invade the valley or when our levees, our lives, our property will be destroyed for want of proper and consistent prosecution of the work.

This is an emergency, gentlemen, and there ought not to be one dollar stricken from the appropriation. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MCGUGIN].

In view of the lengthy debate, without objection the amendment will be again reported for the information of the committee.

The Clerk again reported the McGugin amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all expenditures by or on behalf of the Inland Waterways Corporation shall be accounted for and audited as are expenditures by the executive departments and establishments generally, but in such connection the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized to sanction the use of moneys provided for the operations of the corporation, and to allow credit accordingly for expenditures not otherwise allowable, if and when established to be reasonably necessary to a proper functioning of the legal activities of the corporation.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. McDUFFIE. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, may I take just a minute or two to call the attention of the House to a rather ridiculous situation—I will not call it ridiculous; it is just funny—we are faced with? Here we have the chairman of the great so-called Economy Committee of the House objecting to a measure that will save money for the Treasury. The language objected to by the gentleman from Alabama, the distinguished chairman of the so-called Economy Committee, was inserted in the bill at the request of the Comptroller General of the United States to save money.

It was called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations that the director of the Inland Waterways Corporation—General Ashburn—a few months ago awarded a contract for Diesel engines to other than the lowest bidder. He told me himself he did not have to do business with the lowest bidder, but that he could select any bid he pleased, as he did in this case, where he has paid out of his treasury for Diesel engines to go into one of his river boats \$26,000 more than he could have purchased engines of the same specifications from a low bidder who was thoroughly responsible; and, in fact, was the largest Diesel-motor builder in the United States.

By virtue of the law under which this corporation was incorporated Uncle Sam owns all of the outstanding stock, and it is one of the few agencies of the Federal Government where a purchasing agent does not have to do business with the lowest responsible bidder. That is true, I believe, of the Shipping Board and the Panama Railroad.

This language has been inserted in the bill in the interest of economy and sound business judgment at the request of the Comptroller General, and yet the chairman of the

Economy Committee objects to this procedure and says the language is subject to a point of order. It is subject to a point of order, but it should remain in the bill. The gentleman is going to strike it out of this bill.

It has been put in the bill to save money for the Treasury, but the chairman of the Economy Committee wants to strike it out on a point of order, and probably will because, no doubt, the point of order is good. However, this language ought to stay in the bill, because it simply provides that hereafter the Inland Waterways Corporation will be compelled to do business with the lowest responsible bidders when it advertises for materials and supplies. That is only fair. That applies to every other branch of the Government except this agency and one or two others.

How anyone can assume the attitude of the Economy chairman himself and still maintain that he favors general economy is hard to understand. Good business, fair competition, economy in government, all demand that this Inland Waterways Corporation accept the language of General McCarl and carry on in open, dignified, orderly procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama insist on his point of order?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order. I think the gentleman from Illinois is unduly alarmed. This corporation is functioning well. It was by this Congress placed in a separate status from the average Government agency. So far as its reports go, they show that this corporation has made a profit for the Government and that there has been no waste in the operation of the corporation. I am not urging the continuance of this corporation; but so long as it does continue, its present status should not be disturbed unless it be shown that a change would result in savings.

Now, if the gentleman knows anything about steamboats—I do not know whether he does or not—he knows that there are times when it might be absolutely necessary for the man who operates this corporation to turn down the lowest bid because the bidder did not meet the specifications for a particular engine for a particular type of boat. That is all that happened in the case mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITEN].

There is nothing here to show that any economy will be effected under this provision; on the other hand, it might have the opposite effect.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this paragraph is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. COLLINS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that this provision will not hinder them from doing the thing which the gentleman suggests.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I reserve it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. In the opinion of the Chair, it is very clearly such legislation upon an appropriation bill that does not come within any of the provisions of the Holman rule, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The limitations on the expenditure of appropriations hereinbefore made in this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the Panama Canal.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish at this time to speak out of order and in reference to a statement made by Senator WALSH in his minority views upon the Finance Committee's report to the Senate. He stated in reference to the coal amendment, which I presented and had passed through the House, that—

The proposed duty on coal and coke as carried in the present bill, in our judgment, is utterly preposterous.

He also stated—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is quoting from a Member of another body, and I think we should have order in order to hear what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BOLAND. He stated:

The proponents of this tariff have but one objective. They hope to displace 600,000 tons of imported anthracite coal now sold in New England with an equal amount of Pennsylvania anthracite.

I want to take exception to that statement. The proponents of this amendment are not so much interested in the replacement of 600,000 tons of foreign anthracite coal in New England, but they are very much interested in the anthracite industry of Pennsylvania being destroyed by the shipment of foreign coal into this country. We object to that statement.

In line with that I wish to present to Congress to-day petitions sent to me by Mr. Charles H. Dorrance, of Scranton, Pa., and signed by 55,000 residents of Pennsylvania in protest against the shipment of this foreign coal into this country, which is destroying our industry. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. It was not understood that in presenting the petitions the gentleman from Pennsylvania was going to put these 55,000 signatures on those petitions in the RECORD, because that would accomplish no good purpose. I want it understood that these signatures do not go into the RECORD.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not want them to put the names in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I am with the gentleman on his proposition, but I am against those signatures going in the RECORD, as printing them would cost a large sum of money.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not want the signatures to go in the RECORD, but I am anxious to have the petition noted in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the statements made to the Senate are misleading. They would like Congress to understand that the excise tax on foreign coal would be no benefit to the country. I can not see the consistency of this position in supporting measures to put men back to work and relieve this depression and at the same time antagonize a measure that means so much to the citizens of Pennsylvania, especially the men who work in the coal mines. If these shipments of foreign coal continue to increase coming into the United States it will be only a short time when one of our country's natural resources will be totally destroyed and hundreds of thousands of its citizens thrown out of employment. This foreign coal is being mined by indentured and cheap labor and is destroying the market of our own commodity. I sincerely hope that the Senate now debating upon these excise taxes will pass this amendment and thereby bring happiness and contentment to the people of Pennsylvania whom I have the honor in part to represent in Congress.

I feel sure if the Senator understood all the facts as they exist in the Pennsylvania coal regions and the unemployment and suffering resulting from the importation of foreign coal he would align himself in support of this meritorious measure.

I know these men and I know the menacing effect resulting from this foreign imported coal and as a Member of this Congress it is my duty to bring this important matter to the attention of my colleagues of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the conditions were not so serious, the statement made by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BRITEN] would appear amusing and ridiculous, especially in view of the fact that during the consideration of this bill and during the entire session the gentleman has opposed every effort that has been made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] and the Democratic side to reduce expenditures

so as to enable us to comply with the often-repeated manifestos of the President to balance the Budget.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I can not yield now. I shall yield to the gentleman later on.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SABATH. I can not yield now. I will give the gentleman all the enlightenment he may desire later on.

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not want any enlightenment.

Mr. SABATH. That is the great trouble with my colleague. Day after day from the White House the President, through the press and through some of his representatives on the floor, makes the country believe that he is for economy, and every time a vote is taken on the floor, when real economy is proposed by a Democratic committee, I have observed that with the exception of 16 Members and once with the exception of 23 Members, the balance of the Republican Members have voted to increase instead of to reduce the expenditures. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] with that loud voice of his applauds. He accused the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of being inconsistent, and I am sure the House will agree with me that he does not need my defense or that of any other Member. If there is such a thing as being inconsistent, the gentleman from Wisconsin is the champion of inconsistency.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Has the gentleman been able to find out which one of the gentlemen, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] or the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY], was right in regard to the consistency of the President?

Mr. SABATH. I believe that both of these gentlemen were right and wrong in view of the fact that the President seems to change his views nearly every day as the occasion or political expediency requires. Speaking to the militaristic group, to the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution, he assures them that he is for further expansion of our Army and for a greater number of officers, but in his messages to Congress and in his newspaper interviews for the consumption of the public, he is for retrenchment and economy; of course, the different assurances he has given to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY] have been stated by both of them and these inconsistent statements have been made on the same day. But I shall not go into that, because it is nothing unusual to hear contradictory statements emanating from the White House.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], the very gentleman whom the gentleman is talking about this morning, took more savings out of the economy bill than any one man on this floor?

Mr. SABATH. I realize that; and that is the reason I insisted on securing the floor to bring attention to the fact that he himself, although he is a personal friend of mine, is not consistent. [Laughter and applause.] The only thing I regret is that he does not vote right. He preaches one thing and practices another, the same as a majority of the Members on that side.

A few minutes ago I desired to secure the floor while we were considering the flood-control provision, but unfortunately was unable to do so; and I am going to say now what I desired to say then. I have been one of the Members of the House who has, at least to some extent, aided in establishing the Flood Control Committee, and I have voted for all appropriations which I deemed necessary to preclude the disaster of a few years ago.

But of late, when I have studied the appropriations and the expenditures for the flood control and waterways, I have found that nearly 30 per cent of our appropriations go for overhead expenses and mostly to the military high digni-

taries or engineers who are so bombastically defended by these generals on the floor of this House who, in their militaristic way, fight and oppose every proposition that tends for economy. I greatly deplore that these militaristic gentlemen, some of whom are now on the retired list and drawing their splendid allowance, do not realize and recognize that it is impossible for our country to continue to be as liberal as it has been with them and that it is absolutely necessary to reduce the extravagant allowances or expenditures somewhere. Of course I appreciate that some of them, and many of their able aides on the floor, as had been stated, have been born with a silver spoon in their mouths, and that they have no conception of the hardships to which the people of this country are subjected, especially at this time, to pay additional taxes to make possible the maintenance of our Government.

They do not realize the trials and tribulations of 90 per cent of our citizens to earn, or to reach the point to earn, sufficient compensation or wages to provide for their families. Many of these generals, who have been swarming through this Capitol in the last few days, entered West Point at the age of 18 or 19. And from the day of their entry they receive compensation and education at the expense of the Government and are provided for for life, as when they reach a certain age they are retired, as I understand it, at three-fourths of the salaries they receive on active duty; and this, in the majority of instances, amounts to three to five thousand dollars annually. Surely no one who has ever had the opportunity to go through Presidio at San Francisco, Fort Myer, or Fort Sheridan and attend some of the many festivities will say that the provisions the Government makes for their well-being are meager. Therefore I feel that they should be the first to come forward in times like these of their own free will and dispense with some of the luxuries which they are now enjoying, when, as I have stated previously, 90 per cent of the civilian population of America is in distress and in dire need of relief from overtaxation. We hear so much of the first line of defense, but thus far I have failed, and all of you have failed, to observe any move on their part in defending the organized attacks upon the depleted Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in the last few days I have been seriously considering whether it would not be proper to tax all Government employees, including those in military service, instead of reducing the salaries of our civilian employees earning more than \$2,000 annually, as I had advocated. And if these military gentlemen are as patriotic as they claim to be, then they should not oppose the proposal; in fact, they should come forward and say, "We are ready to do our share and our part to help balance the Budget and relieve the overburdened taxpayers."

I am satisfied that many of them would gladly do so, if they could but understand the seriousness of our financial difficulties, and I would like to hear from some of these military gentlemen or their advocates what possible objection there could be to my proposal. Now, here is a suggestion entitled to serious consideration, and I wonder what their reactions will be. I am inclined to believe that the number of those who would enlist in this proposition would not be commensurate with the number of privates who enlisted to serve the country in her hour of need.

I am the last man in the world who would detract from the great achievements of some of our splendid and brave and courageous officers; but these are not the men who have devoted their energies and time in the corridors of our Capitol and who lobby for increased pay and advancement; these men look with disfavor upon such activities. I am certain that at a close scrutiny it would be disclosed that the less actual military service individuals have rendered the greater are their claims for greatness and deserts.

In all seriousness, I feel that the propaganda under the guise of "no impairment to the national defense," which on the one hand has been going on against any reductions and on the other hand for increases in this bill is an outrage and shame. It is high time that we take heed of the demand of the country and start voting right and start to bring

about the economy which you are preaching and trying to make the country believe you are in favor of. I think it is an outrageous proceeding, and I think it is a clear conspiracy that you are practicing on the American taxpayer and on the American people generally.

Perhaps this editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 16 may more poignantly and more diplomatically express my views on this subject:

If the various governments would take their heavy hands off the resources of the country, the people could get back in their stride again. They can not so long as they are exhausted in trying to meet the demands government makes upon them.

It is self-evident that money can not be diverted into nonessential and nonproductive processes of government and still be had for the work by which the people subsist. Industries can not live by paying taxes instead of dividends and by reducing pay rolls to satisfy government imposts. Cutting the costs of government is obnoxious to the authorities which must make the decision, but the Government is living upon dying resources. It does not produce subsistence. The people can not live upon it. They can not take their livelihood from it. It depends upon their success. So obvious a truism can not be supplanted by a fallacy for the cure of national ills. The thing which lives only by the work of others can not provide life. The parasite does not support its victim.

Mr. BRITTEN. Now, will my buddy yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman referred in very glowing terms to the distinguished chairman of the so-called Economy Committee. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and myself voted together in favor of that economy bill, but the gentleman from Alabama himself voted against it. How does the gentleman account for that?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Alabama does not need any defense at my hands, I assure the gentleman. The country appreciates his noble and sincere and honest efforts in behalf of economy. [Applause.]

I fully appreciate that I shall again be attacked by these professional militaristic officers for my position in refusing to vote for the additional millions which they desire for the 2,000 officers and their perquisites and the maintenance of their automobiles; but between those who live in splendor and luxury, as they are living, and the millions who are unemployed and hungry, my heart goes out to the latter, and my conscience compels me to try at least to aid them. I should like to read, with your permission, a statement in this regard that appeared in the Baltimore Sun:

MILITARY MYSTERY

To see in true perspective the decision of the House of Representatives to reduce the number of Regular Army officers by 2,000, it is necessary to take account of the fact that of the 12,133 officers now on the active list of the Regular Establishment, only 5,031 are actually serving with troops in this country and in all our insular possessions.

It is doubtless true that of the 7,102 officers not actually with troops many are performing service reasonably essential to the national defense. The 466 officers on duty in connection with the National Guard seem, for example, to be doing work as important in its way as the work of those who are engaged in the training of troops. But even so, the presumption must be that with 7,102 officers not on duty with troops and with the troops presumably supplied with an adequate quota of officers, a reduction of considerable proportions in officer personnel could be effected without serious consequences.

After all, the country is in a great deal more danger from extravagance to-day than it is from a foreign invasion, our jingoes to the contrary notwithstanding. The need to put our own domestic finances in order is much more imperative than the need to maintain a tremendous and costly military machine for use against a conjectural foe who, if we conduct ourselves prudently, may never materialize. Why, when we have a very pressing need for economy and no present need for a large Military Establishment, there should be such a hullabaloo over the shifting of 2,000 officers to the retired list, where they will still draw three-quarters pay and be subject to the call of the War Department, is one of the mysteries of this baffling age.

I should like very much to have some of the military gentlemen answer this editorial.

True, I have voted for the pensions, for the increased pay of enlisted men and lower-grade officers, and for compensation and proper hospitalization; yes, I have voted for the bonus, rather the adjustment pay, and I will do everything in my power to see that the balance due to the veterans is paid in cash, regardless of the attitude of the officers. And

I shall anxiously await the position these officers will take in helping the passage of the bonus bill to aid the 2,000,000 needy and deserving ex-service men. I feel that if they would exert only one-half of the influence to help the needy boys as they have utilized for themselves it would materially aid in securing favorable action for the bonus bill, which the President, however, is unfortunately opposed to. And I wish to say that I heartily indorse the plan provided for in the Patman bill, which does not call for any bond issue but only the issuance of Treasury notes. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Chairman, I urgently hope the chairman of this subcommittee will have a roll call on the various amendments that have been adopted during the consideration of this bill whereby \$6,000,000 has been added to the appropriation for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department. I am making this request in the earnest hope that many Members of this body will reconsider and thereby save this Government \$6,000,000.

Recently the President of the Nation issued a clarion call to the people of America, appealing to them to support him in a rigid program of economy. In response to that call the people of my State, far deep in the Southland, have written and urged me to give my earnest cooperation and support to the President in this program of economy. Your people, no doubt, have written you the same thing, and yet many gentlemen, particularly on the other side of the aisle, have added appropriation after appropriation to these bills. I should like for you to consider a few facts with me during these few minutes.

Several days ago you had an opportunity to consolidate the Army and the Navy, and it has been conservatively estimated by the committee that you would have saved the Government approximately \$50,000,000 a year. This you failed to do.

Then, at a later date, there was a movement in this body, a strong and determined effort, to prevent that part of the bill passing whereby 2,000 Army officers were to be relieved from active duty. This will save the Government, I am informed by the chairman of the subcommittee, approximately \$20,000,000 a year.

Since then the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has added amendment after amendment to this bill which will cost the Government \$6,000,000.

Now, gentlemen, the reason for these added appropriations, you contend, is that the national defense would be impaired. Yes; you have given undue stress to the national defense. Let us consider a few facts. During 1917, when war was declared, the Nation sent out a call for men. At that time our country had a weak national defense. To-day I am advised that we have ten times as strong a national defense as we had in 1917, and besides we have the American spirit of patriotism and love of service. The youths of America went to the battlefields of France and there made a record that is now history. Against them came the famous Prussian Guard, representing a nation with a strong national defense. You know the rest of the story. Then, after the war was over, approximately 5,000,000 American boys, well trained in the fundamentals of war tactics, were scattered through the United States from Maine to California and from the State of Washington to the Gulf of Mexico. Yes; all over this country can be found these World War veterans who would within 24 hours respond to the call of their country if the Nation should need them.

As I have listened to these pleas in behalf of the national defense it would seem that many of you gentlemen fear that another war is not far distant. There is not a man here who does not know full well that no nation on this earth can finance another war at this particular time. I say that such propaganda is mere camouflage. True national defense lies in the patriotism of her sons; it is found in the respect that the American people have for this Government—that is true national defense.

We are now passing through a great crisis—one that challenges the best thought and action of the Nation's statesmen. Your people and my people are discouraged. Many are in want and distress. They are looking to us for help. These patriotic citizens expect you and me to reduce all Government expenditures to the minimum. Yes; they also expect us to reduce appropriations for the national defense as much as possible. When you and I courageously perform this duty and once more regain the confidence of the American people—in our Government—there will be no need to fear the strength of the national defense. Let me appeal to you to perform your plain duty. Reduce the national expenses as far as possible.

I say to you, the American people are restless, impatient, and they have a just reason for same. Yes; they have become threadbare. It is high time that we come to their rescue. Like Cicero in the days of long ago, the American people would be well justified in saying to us:

O, Cataline, how long will you hurl your unbridled audacity upon us? How long will your patience abuse us?

Mr. HERR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause. It is very easy for you who have never had an opportunity for service to talk about raising a million men overnight. I want to say to you that if you will go back a few years in history and recall when an army was sent into France the Government had to resort in the end to conscription in order to fill the ranks. May I further call your attention to the fact that you sent over men unprepared, who went over the top unable to fire a musket.

I believe I know something about national defense.

The gentleman talks about love of country and the little likelihood of another war. Does he realize to-day that there is in the Orient a flame that any moment may break out, that will mean a conflagration? It may not reach you, but my part of the country, Seattle, will be the first place to be bombed in case there is warfare in the Orient.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I am in the same boat that the gentleman is.

Mr. HERR. At that time there will be no France, no Belgium, no Italy to hold the hordes back until our people get ready and are prepared.

Mr. ELLZEY. I want the gentleman to distinctly understand that I rendered volunteer service in France, but I believe it is as much my patriotic duty to save every dime for my country in this great crisis as it was to volunteer in 1917.

Mr. HERR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman served in France, he must have forgotten conditions as they existed then if he undertakes to tell us that men can be thrown into conflict without preparation. I do not doubt the gentleman's patriotism, but I do question his ideas of economy. Economy is not economy if it is destructive. Many a man to-day is receiving compensation from the Government because of the fact that he was unable to take care of himself in time of dire disaster. Then again you talk about your economy on your side. I appreciate the gentleman's idea of saving money for the country, but where was he yesterday when on his side of the House his leaders rose and with all the complacency in the world voted \$4,000,000 out of the Treasury. How did the gentleman vote yesterday on that bill? This kind of economy makes me just a little bit out of patience. We talk of saving and you bring in an economy measure that means a \$40,000,000 saving. The next day you who are in the majority bring to us another measure squandering over \$100,000,000. If that is economy, I would like to know it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERR. Yes; sure. I will yield to anybody at any time.

Mr. WHITE. And is not it true that this army that was sent over, for 15 months of that time was not equipped.

Mr. HERR. Absolutely. Does anybody else want to ask a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How long did President Hoover keep the gentleman up talking to him the other night when he kept him from attending a convention in the State of Washington?

Mr. HERR. I think it was about the same length of time that the gentleman spent here when he was arguing about saving that old fort down on the Rio Grande. [Laughter.]

Mr. PARKS. On what page of the Record will I find the speech that the gentleman made against this \$4,000,000 yesterday?

Mr. HERR. Oh, I am not for that kind of a measure. I do not speak against every bill you present that I oppose or I would be speaking all the time. I tell you that you are going to appropriate for unemployment relief, and you ought to quit kidding yourselves into this hysteria of economy.

Mr. PARKS. What side is the gentleman on?

Mr. HERR. I am on the side of taking care of the Government without cutting out the core of its existence.

Mr. PARKS. In other words, you want this appropriation to stand?

Mr. HERR. I want the appropriation to stand; and, if it is for efficiency's sake, to advance more to carry on the affairs of the Government and not by some gesture attempt to fool the public and throttle it.

Mr. PARKS. And the gentleman wants to get it by killing the bill in offering to strike out the enacting clause!

Mr. HERR. The gentleman knows I am saving the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, if a point of order is made, there can be only five minutes more debate on this motion.

Mr. COLLINS. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas begins, will he yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. If it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am not going to say more than half a dozen words. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that the statement was made that all of the soldiers had to be called in by conscription. [Cries of "Oh, no!"] I want to remind the gentleman that we called them without a chance to get in in any other way.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HERR], a military man, who wants to destroy the entire Army appropriation bill. If his motion to strike out its enacting clause carries, there will not be one dollar for any military purpose whatever appropriated. If he strikes out the enacting clause of this bill, which he by his motion seeks to do, our Army will go out of existence, and what will become of his people out in Seattle, whom he says would be the first to be bombed?

Mr. HERR rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I will yield in a minute. When he says there will be no France, no Belgium, and no Italy to hold the hordes back from Seattle, and they will need a big United States Army, just why, then, does he want to kill the Army appropriation bill? I want the gentleman not to attend any function at the White House the night before those wild hordes invade and bomb Seattle, because the President might keep him up talking to him until 12 o'clock, and he would not be able to fly to Seattle in time to save it. I happened to read a little article in the Washington Daily News for May 10, 1932, being an interview the United Press got from the gentleman in Seattle and wired to the News, which I can reproduce word for word almost. It stated that Mr. RALPH HERR was on his way to attend a Republican State convention in Washington.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. HERR. Oh, do not interrupt the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. And that he had to take an airplane, but he struck a storm and he had to come down, and he said that the reason he did not get to that State convention in Washington was because President Hoover had sent him an invitation to dinner, and he said an invitation from the White House was a command to a Congressman and he could not refuse, and that the President talked to him until late in the night. Here is the article, heading and all:

DRY PLANK ADOPTION BLAMED ON HOOVER'S DINNER BY REPRESENTATIVE HERR

SEATTLE, WASH.—RALPH HERR (Republican, Washington) to-day complained that President Hoover prevented him from reaching the State Republican convention in time to work for adoption of resubmission prohibition plank.

"After I had announced I was flying west for the convention," the wet Congressman said, "President Hoover invited me to dinner at the White House. It was virtually a command.

"Then instead of retiring at 10 p. m., as he usually does, the President sat talking until far into the night. I couldn't get a plane until 3 a. m. On top of that we flew into a storm, and by the time I reached Salt Lake City the convention had adopted a dry plank."

Herr suggested the invitation was inspired by Senator WESLEY L. JONES, of Washington, a dry, and that "they knew about the storm, too."

For fear that the United Press and the Washington News might not have gotten his exact position correctly, I want to be absolutely fair with my military friend from Seattle [Mr. HERR], hence I will now show you what his own hometown newspaper, the Post-Intelligencer, of Seattle, Wash., said in its issue of Monday, May 9, 1932, to wit:

HERR BLAMES TRIP DELAY ON HOOVER, JONES—PRESIDENT'S DINNER INVITATION FORCED HIM TO MISS STATE CONVENTION, HE DECLARES—WASHINGTON SENATOR ENGINEERED AFFAIR SO OPPONENT COULD NOT SPEAK, IS INTIMATION

By Lester M. Hunt

When President Hoover invited him to dinner at the White House Thursday night the President didn't want to feed him—he wanted to fool him, Congressman RALPH HERR asserted upon his arrival in Seattle yesterday.

The Congressman attributed his presidential summons to Senator WESLEY L. JONES, long champion of the dry cause, and President Hoover.

HOW IT HAPPENED

It served to prevent Herr from reaching Seattle in time to "deliver a message" to the State Republican convention, which went dry with Herr 800 miles away in Salt Lake City.

Herr was also expected to pay his respects to JONES, as he did at the Bellingham convention two years ago. JONES's supporters here wanted him to stay in Washington, D. C.

Here's how Herr says it happened:

"Last Monday morning I announced that I would fly west Thursday morning to attend the State convention in Seattle.

"The next morning I received an invitation to have dinner at the White House Thursday night. It looked funny to me. Why should Hoover ask me to dinner? I voted against most of the things he wanted in Congress. But I couldn't refuse. It was virtually a command."

LEAVES AT 3 A. M.

So Herr arranged to leave by special plane immediately after the dinner, and still had time to reach Seattle before the convention adjourned.

The President usually goes to bed by 10 o'clock, but not that night, Herr said. He seemed delighted with the gentleman from the West. And they chatted and chatted.

Herr finally took off at 3 o'clock Friday morning and flew into a storm "that they probably knew was coming." He scratched his face in a forced landing in Pennsylvania, was forced down in Nebraska, and finally reached Seattle the day after the battle.

Herr described the "dry swing" at the State convention Saturday as "a joke."

"I am running for office this fall and I am running wet," he declared.

He plans to return to Washington Wednesday.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely, Mr. Chairman, his own hometown paper has not misquoted him.

When he accepted the President's "command" to go to the White House to a dinner, he ought to have known intuitively that the President "did not want to feed him," but "merely wanted to fool him." And some wet Republican should have told him not to imagine that the President would go to sleep at 10 o'clock but that, entertained by such delightful company, the President would keep him up until 3 o'clock in the morning talking to him. When before had the President enjoyed such a wonderful opportunity to talk? Being such

an expert militarist, our friend should have known that getting off late from Washington, at 3 a. m., his Government plane would be sure to strike a storm and have to come down, as the President was commander in chief over both the Government plane and the Government pilot, and in the meantime the Washington State Convention of the great Republican Party would meet and would go dry, but if he had been there it would have gone wet. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HERR. May I state for the edification of the gentleman from Texas that I have never, in all my travels in the air, encountered such blasts as I have just encountered now. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman strikes the political blasts that our friends John Miller and Senator WESLEY JONES are going to give him there this fall, he will think that my blasts look like 30 cents.

Mr. HERR. Just tell his majority.

Mr. BLANTON. But I am sorry the gentleman did not get there. I am sorry the President fooled him. I am sorry that he let that great Republican State convention meet without him. I am sure he could have changed its action. I am sure they would not have voted dry if the wet gentleman had been there. I am sure he could have changed its whole program. I am sure he could have changed the thoughts and opinions of all those great stalwart Republicans in the great State of Washington; but it did go dry, as the gentleman was sent off up into the air and did not get there in time to stop it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a few minutes I will, gladly. My friend is just as inconsistent now, when he speaks against this War Department bill, when he speaks against this Army appropriation bill, where, if he should get passed his motion to strike out its enacting clause, he will be striking at the very life of the United States Army and the Army would be wholly without money, and it could not turn back the horde of foreign invaders with their bombs if he strikes out the enacting clause. He is just as inconsistent when he still talks wet in spite of the dry action by the dry Republican State convention of the State of Washington.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman may rest very easy that the vote in the State of Washington next November is not going to be dry.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it will go Democratic then, because the Republican State convention in that great State has already gone dry, and I predict that the State of Washington will vote dry next November.

Mr. BRITTEN. If it goes Democratic it will be wet. That is where all the wets are coming from.

Mr. BLANTON. There are more wet Republicans in this House than wet Democrats. The Republican State convention which met in Seattle, Wash., on May 7, 1932, voted against repeal of the eighteenth amendment and stood for strict enforcement of all laws. Here is the Associated Press report of its action which appeared in the Post on May 8:

G. O. P. IN WASHINGTON DOWNS REPEAL EFFORTS

SEATTLE, WASH., May 7.—Defeating attempts to insert a prohibition repeal plank in the State platform, the Republican State convention here to-day adopted a party platform that calls for "strict enforcement of all laws."

The prohibition amendment was not mentioned. A request of John J. O'Brien, of Seattle, that a clause calling for submission of the prohibition question to State conventions be added to the program was voted down, 474 to 446.

If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HERR] had not gotten lost up in the air after talking with the President at a "command" dinner in the White House until 3 o'clock in the morning, we "drys" would have lost the great State of Washington.

But I want to say to my friend that I do object to the way his old-time friendly newspaper, the Evening News, of Bellingham, Wash., referred to his escapade in the air. In

its issue of May 10, 1932, in a double-column editorial, it refers to him under the heading "The Egregious HORR." And it says that "Congressman RALPH HORR, of Seattle, invited to be guest at dinner at the White House by President Hoover, ascribes to the President the use of a virtual 'command' to dine as a cheap political trick arranged between the President and United States Senator WESLEY L. JONES to detain HORR from attending the Washington State Republican Convention in time to deliver a tirade against prohibition." It was correct in using the term "tirade," because that is what he would have delivered. And the editorial continues:

A more flagrant or egregious breach of kindly hospitality in high places than that of Mr. HORR has not been recorded. Staunch Republicans reading of HORR's claim were of one mind that it should be called to President Hoover's attention at once.

I do not like for a Republican newspaper even in the old home town bailiwick of my friend from Seattle to make such unkind references to him. But I object most of all to the balance of this 2-column editorial, which says:

Many things are done at Washington in Congress and in politics that might better not be done, yet are passed and accepted, but HORR's action is one that is not done at all by gentlemen of any intelligence. It is explainable as due either to crass ignorance or a cheapness of mental and social attitude positively amazing in one who has been elected to Congress. It is also amazing that the King County voters, who were chiefly responsible for sending HORR to Congress, could have been so misled in their candidate, being otherwise a reasonably enlightened and responsible electorate.

And now HORR has the nerve to announce that he contemplates running for the United States Senate against Mr. JONES.

He is an opportunist, pure and simple, and believes, with a certain species of cleverness, that he should grasp his political tide while it seems on the flood. In this forthcoming contest for the Senate the voters who once supported him will have given them a splendid chance to correct their former error and retire him to private life, where he should thereafter be kept retired, since he is certainly no adornment for them or the State of Washington, or proof of their sagacity in selecting him to go there.

His attitude in support of prohibition repeal is not in consideration here, either for or against. But his reception of the President's hospitality, just one instance of several demonstrating his congressional unfitness, is the most glaring to date. His constituents may expect it to be followed by other breaches, as it seems that he is the sort of unstable and unfitted public official in whom his constituency can find safety only through permanent retirement.

Mr. BLANTON. That paper out there ought to be fair. It ought to have been fair enough to the gentleman to have stated that if the President had not talked to him until 3 o'clock a. m., our friend might have flown to Seattle in a Government plane in time to have changed the action of the State convention. He did not change it. The next time I hope he will not talk to the President so long. What were you talking about that night, Ralph? [Laughter and applause.] But being always just, I must be fair to the President, who, if nothing else, is most kind and courteous to all new, inexperienced, young members of his own party. The President has a custom of adding three novices to his list when inviting the old-timers to dine. He takes the youngsters down the line alphabetically. It so happened that on that night he had reached the "Ho's" in the novices. So it happened that he invited ROBERT L. HOGG, PEHR G. HOLMES, and RALPH A. HORR. The President really meant to feed them. He did not intend to talk to them. Yet our friend unkindly charges that he was called there to keep him away from Seattle.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is the gentleman insinuating that the President called him away purposely?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. That is what the gentleman himself stated, as I have used the exact report of his interview in my remarks. But it will be worth the money to our friend. He will never let them get him up into the air again at 3 a. m. in a Government plane controlled by the President, whose plans he voted against.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Washington to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were ayes 0 and noes 75.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including the following: Compensation of all officials and employees; foreign and domestic newspapers and periodicals; law books not exceeding \$1,000; textbooks and books of reference; printing and binding, including printing of annual report; rent and personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase or exchange of typewriting, adding, and other machines; purchase or exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; claims for damages to vessels passing through the locks of the Panama Canal, as authorized by the Panama Canal act; claims for losses of or damages to property arising from the conduct of authorized business operations; claims for damages to property arising from the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal; acquisition of land and land under water, as authorized in the Panama Canal act; expenses incurred in assembling, assorting, storing, repairing, and selling material, machinery, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased or acquired for the construction of the Panama Canal which are unserviceable or no longer needed, to be reimbursed from the proceeds of such sales; expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations on the Isthmus; expenses incident to any emergency arising because of calamity by flood, fire, pestilence, or like character not foreseen or otherwise provided for herein; traveling expenses, when prescribed by the Governor of the Panama Canal to persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business; and for such other expenses not in the United States as the Governor of the Panama Canal may deem necessary best to promote the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal, all to be expended under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal and accounted for as follows:

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is now quite apparent that as we draw to the end of this bill there will be no material reductions in the appropriations provided by this bill. If there were to be any reductions in any part of the bill as printed, of course, they would come in some of these later appropriations. Obviously, they would come from rivers and harbors and the flood-control appropriations. The House has turned down any reductions in those two appropriations. Therefore, I give up in despair of having any economy read into this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman realize there will be a roll-call vote shortly?

Mr. McGUGIN. I shall be glad to have a roll call. I can think of nothing that would please me more, especially in line with the statement made by my friend from Tennessee, Mr. BYRNS, than that there would be a roll call on the rivers and harbors appropriation, and I would ask for no greater favor than to have the opportunity to have it written into the RECORD that I voted for a reduction in the rivers and harbors appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Have we not been compelled to meet this threat from the chairman all the way through these appropriation bills?

Mr. McGUGIN. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. No. I do not yield to the gentleman or anybody else.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman live far away from rivers and harbors?

Mr. McGUGIN. The committee has asked us to take a reduction in the national defense. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has spoken to the effect that we do not need so much preparation. The gentleman said something about the fact that some 4,000,000 men were, not so long ago, 13 years ago, discharged from the Army after their experience in the World War. They are 13 years older to-day than they were then. They did a good job saving this Nation once in its hour of peril.

Certainly as the years go by we can not call upon that generation to do the job again.

This country has been unprepared for every war we have fought. We have not fought a war without losing thousands of men who were not prepared for war. Some 10 or 15 years before the World War started, a great Democrat started the cry, "In the event of war a million men will spring to arms overnight." Oh, that was popular then in the days of peace, but that kind of psychology kept this country from being prepared, and when 4,000,000 men went into the Army, thousands were killed or injured because they were not prepared and because they had not had a fair chance to be prepared.

Pardon the reference as far as my own military experience is concerned. I do not claim to be either a hero or a martyr. I spent most of my time at Brest. I saw thousands and thousands of men pass through that camp. I came in contact with many who had been in the Army less than a month. I saw men leaving Brest to go to the front as replacements who had never shouldered a gun. Many of these men were killed because they did not know how to take care of themselves, and their blood is upon the hands of America, because they were sent into war without being given a chance for their lives.

All we have left in our national defense act is reserve officers, the citizens' military training camps, and the National Guard. If we are to depend upon a civilian army, we should give it a fair chance.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. I can not yield.

As to the reserve officers who go to camp this summer you do not wish to pay them a fair salary. I know the Government of the United States is hard up, but it is not so hard up that it can not pay its honest debts. Why do you want these men to go to camp and not be paid their fair salary? You say you will give them a dollar a day and their living, but as officers they have to buy their own uniforms. Others working for the Government are not working for nothing, just because the Government is hard up. I have observed that this political Congress will not vote for a fair reduction of 11 per cent of that part of salaries over \$1,000 of others on the pay roll. That kind of just economy would have saved tens of millions of dollars. Yet to-day we are asked to compel patriotic reserve officers to sacrifice their just salaries and thereby save a million or two. The reason for this disgusting conduct on the part of Congress is that there are not many voters among the reserve officers while there are hundreds of thousands of voters on the general pay roll.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to my good friend from Kansas, and for the enlightenment of the House, I read the following:

Army officers and reserve officers have been filling the halls and galleries of the House of Representatives during the past 10 days. And every mail has brought hundreds of letters for Members of Congress, urging them not to abolish the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the citizens' military training camps. The letters were first sent to all Reserve Officers' Training Corps college boys to pass on to parents and friends, to forward back to Representatives.

As a result a considerable body of House Members decided that Reserve Officers' Training Corps camps and the citizens' military training camps must not be abolished, even in this year of severe financial difficulty.

To-day they will decide whether the money for these vacation camps for sons of well-to-do families shall be saved at the expense of the poorest and neediest people in the country. They will vote on postponing \$10,000,000 worth of river and harbor work, and \$8,000,000 worth of flood-control work which the House Appropriations Committee left in the War Department bill because it will provide work for thousands of men desperately in need of that work.

Of all economies proposed to a reluctant Congress the proposal to suspend for a year the summer camps heretofore provided by the Government for college boys and a carefully selected group of other young men was the most reasonable.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps boys are junior and senior college students. If they are seniors, they have already had one summer camp. If they are juniors, they will have an opportunity to go to camp next year. Their status as reserve officers will not be altered in the least if they do not go to camp this year.

But a majority of the House membership voted Tuesday to provide this 42-day outing for some 7,200 college boys, together with 70 cents a day pay and subsistence. They voted to provide a 30-day outing for 37,500 other boys, the great majority of whom go to camp for a year, or perhaps two, and make no effort to complete the course which will make them reserve officers. They voted, also, to pay members of the Organized Reserves at the rate officers of the Regular Army are paid, instead of letting them go to camp this year with nothing but \$1 a day from the Government.

They overturned the Appropriations Committee on these matters in spite of the fact that all civilian departments of Government have been cut even more drastically than the committees recommended, and in spite of the fact that corresponding training courses in the Navy have been suspended.

So far, President Hoover, who could control the activities of the military gentlemen that forced this remarkable about face, has not rebuked them. It is time he did so and did it publicly. He should do it before the final vote is taken by the House on this question.

Mr. Chairman, that is an editorial printed in the Washington Daily News of to-day, May 19, 1932. I think it clearly presents to this House the questions upon which we will be called upon to vote in a few minutes.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. I wish to say that my stand on this matter goes back to a year or a year and a half ago when the gentlewoman from Montana, the first Congresswoman, Miss Rankin, came to your office and to my office, and to the office of every Congressman asking for the elimination of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the citizens' military training camps, and every cadet activity in every high school in the United States. This was pacifism of the first water, and is what caused me to believe we should provide for these activities.

Mr. BYRNS. Miss Rankin did the gentleman an honor she did not confer upon me. This does not eliminate these camps. It only cuts them out for one year. There is no question involved in this. No one has ever considered me to be a pacifist.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman would not want to blame me for having heard the generals or criticize me for having heard them.

Mr. BYRNS. I am not criticizing anyone. I have read the editorial. I do not seek to make any personal application. Let each gentleman apply it to his own position upon the question. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal: Salary of the governor, \$10,000; purchase, inspection, delivery, handling, and storing of materials, supplies, and equipment for issue to all departments of the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, other branches of the United States Government, and for authorized sales; payment in lump sums of not exceeding the amounts authorized by the injury compensation act approved September 7, 1916 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 793), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal; for continuing the construction for the Madden Dam across the Chagres River at Alhajuela for the storage of water for use in the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, together with a hydroelectric plant, roadways, and such other work as in the judgment of the Governor of the Panama Canal may be necessary, to cost in the aggregate not to exceed \$15,500,000; in all, \$9,091,011, together with all moneys arising from the conduct of business operations authorized by the Panama Canal act.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: On page 76, line 17, after the word "act," insert: "and such sums, aggregating not to exceed \$3,500,000, as may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as dividends by the Panama Railroad Co. in excess of 10 per cent of the capital stock of such company."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what this means?

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order until the explanation is made.

Mr. TABER. I think if the gentleman wants to make a point of order, it ought to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion the point of order comes too late.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there has been no debate.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet endeavoring to reserve a point of order when the gentleman from Wisconsin reserved his point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there has been no discussion of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear any point of order made or reserved.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the gentleman from Wisconsin turned to the gentleman from Mississippi and said to the gentleman, "Explain what this means." That is debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not deny making that statement.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet endeavoring to reserve a point of order at the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there has been no discussion, and the uniform ruling has been that if there has been no discussion a point of order is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi yielded to the gentleman from New York. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order comes too late.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is entitled to an explanation of this situation. Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended a cut of \$3,500,000 in the appropriation for the completion of the Madden Dam at the Panama Canal. The total amount that is to be spent upon this project has been authorized and contracted for, and there will be required to meet the contract payments in the fiscal year 1933 approximately \$4,500,000. Out of that amount there is carried in this bill as it came from the committee \$1,000,000. The committee figured that the balance of \$3,500,000 could be provided out of the funds of the Panama Railroad. The Panama Railroad unquestionably has some surplus funds that can be used for General Treasury purposes, but it has no legal authority to spend money to build the Madden Dam. The only way those funds could be used would be by the Panama Railroad declaring a dividend, paying it into the Treasury, and its being used in that way.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi has offered an amendment which permits dividends that are declared by the Panama Railroad in excess of the regular 10 per cent dividends upon the stock, which is paid into the Treasury and is included in the Treasury estimates of receipts, to be used for the purpose of paying for this contract authorization. Frankly, I have doubts as to whether or not the railroad corporation will be able to declare \$3,500,000 in addition to the regular 10 per cent, or \$700,000. At the same time they are in a position where they can declare a very substantial proportion of it.

Perhaps a thorough investigation of the situation will reveal that the whole amount can be declared. I have made this statement rather than some member of the committee, because I have the misfortune of being a director of the Panama Railroad and, perhaps, know a little more about the details.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. This would not be taken from the fund for ship replacement?

Mr. TABER. No; it would be taken from some other replacement fund which we have no idea of using. For instance, there was a barge-replacement fund, and the barges have been abandoned, and other replacement funds on activities which have been abandoned, like the renewal of the coal trestle at Colon. We would not affect the steamship-rebuilding fund in this way. Frankly, I question whether we can go as far as the \$3,500,000 which is suggested here; but

if we can not, it will simply have to be taken care of in a deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. No appropriation under the Department of War available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act (1) to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended, (2) to increase the compensation of any position in the field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia, (3) to increase the compensation of any position under such act through re-allocation, (4) to increase the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through advancement to another position in the same grade or to a position in a higher grade at a rate in excess of the minimum rate of such higher grade unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation, or (5) to increase the compensation of any other civil position under the War Department: *Provided*, That from the date of this act to and including June 30, 1933, payment for personal services made in accordance herewith shall constitute payment in full for such services. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of the amounts so impounded for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment striking out the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: Beginning on page 78, line 11, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the chairman of the subcommittee that we had a vote on this section on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation, and thereafter when the matter came up in the next appropriation bill the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] announced to the House that if this section were finally stricken from any bill he would consent to striking it from the other bills. The Department of the Interior bill has stricken from it this particular section; and when the Navy appropriation bill came before the House, I made a motion to strike out, and it was consented to. I think, in keeping with this action, the section should also go out.

Mr. COLLINS. I shall respect any agreement that the chairman of this committee has made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for maintaining, driving, or operating any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment except in cases of medical officers on out-patient medical service and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary and then only as to such latter cases when the same is approved by the head of the department. This section shall not apply to any motor vehicle for official use of the Secretary of War, and no other persons connected with the War Department or the Military Establishment, except medical officers on out-patient medical service, shall have a Government-owned motor vehicle assigned for their exclusive use.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the number of this section may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes this bill, as amended, will be reported to the House. The Committee of the Whole has added to this bill on account of the so-called civil components a total of \$5,794,165. That is the record that has been made for economy. The economy bill left this House practically stripped, and upon its heels we find this measure reduced by 20 per cent below the total

amount by which the Appropriations Committee proposed to reduce the Budget estimate as a part of the general retrenchment program.

It is my purpose, when we get into the House, to ask for a record vote on each of the amendments contributing to that increase. I can not believe that the Members of this House, with unemployment nation-wide, with business paralyzed, with Federal revenues so low as to make necessary virtually a war-time tax measure, will, by their vote, impose this additional burden upon the people.

What are these propositions?

First. You will be asked to vote upon whether or not we shall expend \$2,109,768 to give active-duty training, with pay, to 19,000 men attached to the Officers' Reserve Corps; men, gentlemen, I dare say practically without exception, who are engaged in some gainful pursuit; men who for the most part are connected with business houses and industrial plants that have been besieging this Congress to economize—to balance the Budget; and yet the proponents of this amendment would have you believe that these men must be assured of compensation before they will engage in active-duty training. It is an insult to the patriotism of such men.

I wonder just how many of the 19,000 actually have expressed personal opposition to the action proposed by the committee; and I wonder also, gentlemen, just how many of the 19,000 actually know just exactly what the committee's proposal is. Much misinformation is abroad. I was told yesterday by a Member that he had received a wire from a college president, if you please, urging him to oppose the proposal to abolish the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. That college president did not assume any such thing. I maintain that he has been deliberately misinformed, and these telegrams that are coming in here, which seem to frighten so many of you, are inspired by that sort of propaganda. And let me remind you that the great mass of people who are asking for relief, who are asking for employment—yes; who even are begging for food—can not send you telegrams; they have no paid representatives here in Washington who are also working for their own selfish interests; they are looking to you and to me. We are not the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States. We are the association of the rank and file of the people of these United States, and I suspect that that will be rather forcibly impressed upon us before we are convened again in regular session.

The second proposition you will be asked to vote upon is whether or not you will add \$1,080,773 to this bill for sending approximately 7,200 college boys to camp for 42 days during the next fiscal year. College boys, gentlemen. Think of it! And not only to send them to these camps, pay their transportation, but to subsist them, provide them with medical care, and what else? Pay them cash at the rate of 70 cents per day, or approximately \$30, for the privilege of going. The proposition is preposterous in times like these.

The committee's provision does not in any way, shape, or form disturb their school training. We provide the money for uniforms, we provide the money for instructors and equipment, and we provide the money for actually paying these students 30 cents a day for the last two years of their college courses. The boys who graduate in June have been to one camp. The boys who finish their third year in June will have an opportunity to go to camp at the close of their senior year, and from this very date until that time they will continue to draw from the Government 30 cents a day. And gentlemen tell us that it will cripple our national defense if these young men, who have had either three or four years of instruction in military tactics, do not go to camp next year. If you do not vote this amendment down, I will tell you what you will impair. You will impair the faith of the American people in the good judgment of this Congress to deal with the present emergency.

Lastly, you will be asked to vote upon whether or not you will add \$2,603,624 to this bill for the conduct of the citizens' military training camps. I have given you the opinion of the former Chief of Staff, General Summerall, as

to this activity. I have told you that the present adjutant general of the Army, General Bridges, has said that it might be dispensed with for one or two years without doing any harm. I have not told you before that an officer of the General Staff submitted to a member of this committee a list of suggested reductions in this bill aggregating \$10,000,000, which included the suspension of this activity.

Now, it is just a question of whether or not we will save \$2,603,624 on this activity alone, or, contrary to the judgment of these military men, spend that amount to send 37,500 boys, mostly in their teens, to camp for 30 days, not primarily to train them as soldiers, but to improve them physically and to instruct them in citizenship. Better would we expend that amount in helping the physical condition of those who are hungry, and in raising the confidence of those whose faith in their Government has been shaken through long deprivation. You will find but precious few of the sons of these unfortunates in the citizens' military training camps.

Mr. Chairman, unrest stalks abroad. Some would have you believe that these civil items are essential to the national defense. Do they mean from within? Certainly they can not mean from without. National defense, my friends, does not entirely mean a man who has been taught to obey orders or tote a gun.

A healthy, happy citizenry is the very foundation of national defense. You will not promote it by sustaining these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the bill in its present state provides for the retirement of 2,000 officers of the Regular Army, as proposed by the committee. Whether or not an effort will be made in the House to keep the commissioned strength of the Regular Army at its present number, I am not advised, but I shall take advantage of this opportunity to read a letter that came to me this morning from an active commissioned officer of the Regular Army. It is deserving of the attention and consideration of every man here. It reads as follows:

I am a Regular Army captain and also, I believe, a loyal and patriotic citizen. What is more, I am a taxpayer.

I like the Army; I believe in it, and yet I am not blinded to the fact that 2,000 officers can be removed from it without decreasing our national defense one iota. In fact, it is evident to me that, if it were possible to remove 4,000 of the most ineffective officers, the present work of handling Regular troops and instructing the civilian components could be handled just as effectively and, of course, more efficiently by the remaining 8,000.

I am prompted to write by the barrage of such talk as "hamstringing national defense," "wrecking the Army" and the like. We who are engaged in the workaday jobs of the Army know what nonsense this is. Whether the high Army officials and others who shape our policies know this, is problematical. When they inspect us everything is rehearsed ahead of time; they see only what they are supposed to see and are told what they want to be told; they deal with the Army in theory more than in fact.

Would it be hamstringing the national defense because 8,000 officers would be required to do efficiently what 12,000 officers are now puttering around with? No; because these 8,000 will be and will have to be more efficient. The 4,000 would not be exiled or suddenly exterminated. They would still be available for emergency; in return for retired pay they could be required to keep fit and to be periodically mobilized and trained a couple of weeks per year if desired, like reserve officers. Many business organizations have cut out overhead personnel and deadwood and increased production.

Will it wreck the Army if 100 "gilded aides" (private secretaries) have to be put to military work; if 100 post-exchange officers (small-town storekeepers) on posts now adequately served by civilian stores and markets are put back into military productivity; if several hundred property officers now counting socks and ash cans (the work of an \$1,800 bonded stock clerk) go back to the work of military training; if 100 broken-down colonels puttering around corps-area headquarters while juniors do their work are put on the retired list, where they should have gone years ago; if several hundred officers sitting around offices in Federal buildings of every large city, sending out mimeographed pep bulletins and getting up smokers for reserve officers are put to constructive military work?

Is it going to wreck the Reserve Officers' Training Corps if Purdue University, now having 14 Regular Army officers of Field Artillery, is cut down to 4 Field Artillery officers? Has not every officer in the Army heard the customary remark about the Reserve Officers' Training Corps detail at this college or that school, "The 4-year rest up at Blank University"?

The fact that pacifists are in favor of this reduction means nothing; the reduction will strengthen rather than weaken our defense. There is nothing so weakening to defense as having a large number of officers puttering around, holding meaningless jobs,

and making useless motions. The reduction will mean that our top-heavy list of senior officers who, because of their rank, now consider themselves "done with detail," will have to forget their slogan and get back to arduous military duties again.

No more will we see a colonel commanding a second lieutenant and 20 men on a caretaking job, or twenty-odd officers on a post with but 150 men, or 25 officers of field grade on a post of 2,500 men, or two companies fully officered but with so few men that they are combined as one for drill each day, while on alternate days one batch of officers twiddle their thumbs.

I believe you are right about the value of the National Guard. I have been on duty with units of it in Massachusetts and Illinois. I firmly believe that the average National Guard officer, in these States at least, is further along in the technical knowledge of his branch of the service than is the Regular Army officer. We spend so much time checking property, sitting on boards and courts, running post exchanges and movie shows, policing up the post, acting as office manager and private secretary, acting as adjutant or executive for some "done-with-detail" superior, that we are lucky if we are able to spend on technical advancement the one night per week usually spent by the guard officer.

I believe this bill is going to have a rejuvenating effect on the Army, but as long as the reduction is going to be on the basis of selection according to efficiency, why not go all the way and insure future efficiency by making subsequent promotions a matter of selection? The majority of Army officers, due to war entry, are a homogeneous mass as far as length of service is concerned. Majors and first lieutenants differ in length of service only by a few months in many cases; consequently length of service has ceased to have value as a gage of ability. No doubt favoritism would creep in, but nine out of ten aggressive and capable officers would take their chances on favoritism for the opportunity of rising by merit. I should have said the younger officers would prefer this; the older ones whose efficiency is no longer increasing at the same rate naturally would not want the risk of being passed over. Regardless of the dangers of selection, the good officer would on the average tend to rise to the top.

I am conscious of the courage and good sense of the backers of this bill, in spite of the cries of "pacifist" and "politics." May all Government departments be snapped out of their lethargy by the same drastic methods.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi a question.

I recall when the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill was up the gentleman from Mississippi offered a motion which limited the amount that might be paid for any passenger-carrying vehicle to \$750, and said he would offer the amendment in respect of all the other appropriation bills. It does not seem to be in this particular bill, and I would like to have the gentleman explain that.

Mr. COLLINS. That is because we do not carry any money for passenger-carrying vehicles here.

Mr. JONES. There is no conflict between those bills and the bill under consideration, and the gentleman has not abandoned his position of economy in that respect?

Mr. COLLINS. No, indeed. The bill would have carried a similar provision had the bill made provision for passenger-carrying motor vehicles.

Mr. JONES. And the gentleman still intends to have that apply to all bills in which there is provision made for new cars?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GOSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if the section just read is carried in all the other bills as it is in this bill? I understood it had gone out of one of the appropriation bills.

Mr. COLLINS. The other bills carry the \$750 limitation except the Navy bill, and I understand there were no purchase items for passenger-carrying automobiles in the Navy appropriation bill.

Mr. GOSS. What about the use of such automobiles? We are restricting the use of them in this provision.

Mr. COLLINS. The provision that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is referring to is a provision that affects the purchase of new cars.

Mr. GOSS. But I am referring to section 3, which has just been numbered 2, starting at line 15, page 79, and going over to line 6, on page 80; and if my recollection serves me correctly, this provision was omitted from the Navy bill.

Mr. COLLINS. It is the same provision, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman assures us it was carried in the other bill?

Mr. COLLINS. It was carried in the Navy bill.

Mr. JONES. And there is no distinction made so far as the purchase of any cars is concerned?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. JONES. I am interested in practicing economy in government in every possible way. I have in my hand a wire signed by a number of the citizens of my home town, and which I have asked to have read to the House. I have called its substance to your attention heretofore. In this message these citizens plead that the Budget be balanced by reducing expenses instead of further increasing the terrific burden of taxation, that the Members reduce their own salaries and abolish any and all unnecessary expenses, that they refuse to listen to small minority groups, and that they vote in the interest of the people of the whole country. This is the sentiment expressed throughout the land.

I have voted for the economy program right down the line. I have not only voted for the reductions offered, but have offered a number of additional amendments making further reductions. Some of these votes were not easy to cast, but I feel that during these times this is the wise course.

Much of the criticism of Congress is justified. I think, however, it is but fair to add that the Congress has reduced every appropriation bill not only much below last year's appropriation, but also below the requests made by the President through the Bureau of the Budget. They reduced the agriculture appropriation bill \$10,000,000 below the President's request; the Commerce bill \$5,500,000 below his request; the Treasury and Post Office bills \$22,700,000 below his request; the Navy bill \$15,000,000; the War Department bill \$24,000,000, and the Interior bill \$6,000,000 below his request, and other bills in similar proportions, a total of \$161,000,000 below what the President asked for in his Budget, and \$563,000,000 below last year's appropriations for the same purposes.

I think Congress made a mistake in taking so many items out of the economy bill, but I believe this will be corrected. This was a special bill for additional reductions; that is, in addition to those mentioned above. I not only voted for these reductions but sought to include further ones. One thing that made this difficult was the fact that the members of the President's Cabinet so often protested against the reductions proposed in their respective departments.

The economy bill as it passed the House provides for an 11 per cent reduction in the salaries of the Members of Congress. I voted for the amendment which would have made this reduction 25 per cent on salaries of over \$8,000, including Members of Congress. I felt and now feel that during these serious times everyone should be willing to make a sacrifice.

I thought it proper to call these facts to the attention of those who might be interested, because the action of the House on the economy bill has in some instances caused the public to lose sight of the actual reductions that have been made. The records will show these facts as indisputable.

I am glad to see the public interest that is being manifested in reducing the expenses of government. It is highly important that the centralization in government should be halted, that the manifold activities of government should be curtailed. I do not care who gets the credit, just so we get economy.

WILLIAM WOLFF SMITH

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order for the purpose of making an announcement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have just received a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Bureau to the effect that he has accepted the resignation of William Wolff

Smith as special counsel for the Veterans' Bureau, effective immediately after the expiration of his annual leave. [Applause.]

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Barbour amendment, page 54, line 5, relating to the Organized Reserves, and a separate vote on another Barbour amendment on page 54, relating to the Organized Reserves; also the amendment with reference to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps amendment on page 58 and the citizens' military training camps amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], on page 61, line 2, four amendments in all.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARBOUR: On page 54, in line 5, strike out "\$4,244,580" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,354,348"; and on page 52, line 11, strike out the comma at the end of the line; and in line 12 strike out the words "except as hereinafter provided"; and on page 54 strike out the paragraph commencing in line 23 and ending in line 11 on page 55.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARBOUR) there were 107 ayes and 101 noes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 168, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—218

Adkins	Campbell, Pa.	Dickstein	Hall, N. Dak.
Aldrich	Carley	Dieterich	Hancock, N. Y.
Allen	Carter, Calif.	Douglas, Ariz.	Hancock, N. C.
Andresen	Carter, Wyo.	Douglass, Mass.	Hardy
Andrew, Mass.	Cavicchia	Doutrich	Hart
Andrews, N. Y.	Celler	Dowell	Hartley
Arentz	Chavez	Drewry	Hawley
Bacharach	Chindblom	Eaton, Colo.	Hess
Bachmann	Chiperfield	Eaton, N. J.	Hogg, W. Va.
Bacon	Ciancy	Englebright	Holmes
Baldrige	Clarke, N. Y.	Erk	Hooper
Barbour	Cochran, Pa.	Evans, Calif.	Hopkins
Beam	Cole, Iowa	Fernandez	Hornor
Beedy	Cole, Md.	Flesinger	Horr
Black	Colton	Finley	Hull, William E.
Bland	Connolly	Fish	James
Bloom	Cooke	Fitzpatrick	Jeffers
Boileau	Cooper, Tenn.	Foss	Johnson, Ill.
Boland	Corning	Frear	Johnson, S. Dak.
Bolton	Coyle	Free	Johnson, Wash.
Bowman	Crall	Gasque	Kading
Briggs	Culkin	Gavagan	Kahn
Britten	Cullen	Goss	Keller
Brumm	Curry	Granfield	Kelly, Ill.
Brunner	Dallinger	Green	Kelly, Pa.
Buckbee	Darrow	Griffin	Kemp
Burdick	Davenport	Griswold	Kendall
Burtness	Delaney	Kennedy	Kennedy
Butler	DeRouen	Hall, Ill.	Ketcham

Kinzer	Millard	Rich	Swick
Kleberg	Montague	Rogers, Mass.	Swing
Knutson	Montet	Rogers, N. H.	Temple
Kopp	Mouser	Rudd	Thomason
Kurtz	Niedringhaus	Sanders, Tex.	Thurston
Leavitt	Nolan	Sandlin	Tierney
Lehlbach	Norton, N. J.	Schafer	Timberlake
Lichtenwalner	O'Connor	Schuetz	Tinkham
Lindsey	Oliver, N. Y.	Seger	Treadway
Loneragan	Overton	Seiberling	Turpin
Loofbourov	Parker, Ga.	Shott	Wason
Luce	Parker, N. Y.	Shreve	Watson
McCormack	Parsons	Simmons	Weaver
McFadden	Peavey	Sirovich	Weeks
McGugin	Perkins	Snell	Welch, Calif.
McLaughlin	Person	Somers, N. Y.	White
McLeod	Pettengill	Stalker	Wigglesworth
McMillan	Pittenger	Stevenson	Wilson
McSwain	Prall	Stewart	Wingo
Maas	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Stokes	Withrow
Magrady	Pratt, Ruth	Strong, Pa.	Wolcott
Maloney	Purnell	Stull	Wolverton
Mapes	Ransley	Sullivan, N. Y.	Wyant
Martin, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.	Sutphin	Yates
Martin, Oreg.	Reid, Ill.	Swanson	
May	Reilly	Sweeney	

NAYS—168

Allgood	Evans, Mont.	LaGuardia	Rankin
Aimon	Fishburne	Lambertson	Rayburn
Amile	Flannagan	Lambeth	Robinson
Arnold	French	Lanham	Romjue
Ayres	Fulbright	Lankford, Ga.	Sabath
Bankhead	Fuller	Larrabee	Sanders, N. Y.
Barton	Gambrill	Larsen	Schneider
Blanton	Garber	Lewis	Selvig
Boehne	Gilbert	Linthicum	Sinclair
Brand, Ga.	Glichrist	Lovette	Smith, Va.
Brand, Ohio	Gillen	Lozier	Smith, W. Va.
Buchanan	Glover	Ludlow	Snow
Bulwinkle	Goldsborough	McClintic, Okla.	Sparks
Burch	Greenwood	McClintock, Ohio	Spence
Busby	Gregory	McDuffie	Stafford
Byrns	Guyer	McKeown	Steagall
Campbell, Iowa	Haines	McReynolds	Strong, Kans.
Canfield	Hall, Miss.	Major	Summers, Wash.
Cannon	Hare	Manlove	Sumners, Tex.
Carden	Harlan	Mansfield	Swank
Cartwright	Hastings	Mead	Taber
Christgau	Haugen	Miller	Tarver
Christopherson	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Taylor, Colo.
Clague	Hill, Wash.	Mobley	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, N. C.	Hoch	Moore, Ky.	Thatcher
Cochran, Mo.	Holaday	Moore, Ohio	Underhill
Collins	Hope	Morehead	Underwood
Condon	Houston, Del.	Nelson, Me.	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Ohio	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Vinson, Ky.
Cox	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Warren
Crisp	Hull, Morton D.	Norton, Nebr.	Welsh, Pa.
Cross	Jacobsen	Oliver, Ala.	West
Crosser	Jenkins	Palmisano	Whitley
Crowe	Johnson, Mo.	Parks	Whittington
Crump	Johnson, Okla.	Partridge	Williams, Mo.
Davis	Johnson, Tex.	Patman	Williams, Tex.
Dickinson	Jones	Patterson	Wolfenden
Dies	Karch	Polk	Wood, Ga.
Disney	Kerr	Pou	Wood, Ind.
Doughton	Kniffin	Rainey	Woodruff
Doxey	Kunz	Ramseyer	Woodrum
Ellzey	Kvale	Ramspeck	Wright

NOT VOTING—46

Abernethy	Crowther	Gifford	Owen
Auf der Heide	De Priest	Golder	Ragon
Beck	Dominick	Goodwin	Shallenberger
Bohn	Drane	Hogg, Ind.	Shannon
Boylan	Driver	Hollister	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Dyer	Igoe	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Eslick	Lamneck	Tilson
Cary	Estep	Lankford, Va.	Tucker
Chapman	Freeman	Lea	Williamson
Chase	Fulmer	Michener	Yon
Collier	Garrett	Mitchell	
Connery	Gibson	Murphy	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Eslick (against).
Mr. Tilson (for) with Mr. Browning (against).
Mr. Auf der Heide (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Tucker with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Bohn.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Hogg of Indiana.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Cable.
Mr. Yon with Mr. Michener.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Dominick with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Ragon with Mr. Williamson.

Mr. Driver with Mr. Lankford of Virginia.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Smith of Idaho.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Igoe with Mr. De Priest.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Hollister.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Tennessee, Mr. ESICK, is unavoidably absent on account of illness. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY, is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the adjoining room and did not hear my name called. If I had permission to vote, I should vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 54, line 23, strike out the paragraph commencing on line 23 and ending in line 11, page 55.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARBOUR) there were—ayes 187, noes 141.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 58, line 20, strike out "\$2,998,711" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,079,484," and on page 58, line 21, after the comma, strike out all matter down to and including the comma at the end of line 2, page 59.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 151, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]
YEAS—236

Adkins	Coyle	Hart	Magrady
Aldrich	Cral	Hartley	Major
Allen	Crowe	Hawley	Maloney
Andrew, Mass.	Crump	Hess	Manlove
Arentz	Culkin	Holmes	Mapes
Arnold	Cullen	Hooper	Martin, Mass.
Bacharach	Curry	Hopkins	Martin, Oreg.
Bachmann	Dallinger	Hornor	May
Bacon	Darrow	Horr	Mead
Baldrige	Davenport	Houston, Del.	Michener
Barbour	Delaney	Hull, William E.	Millard
Beam	DeRoven	James	Montague
Beedy	Dickstein	Jeffers	Montet
Black	Dieterich	Johnson, Ill.	Mouser
Bland	Douglas, Ariz.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Me.
Bloom	Douglass, Mass.	Johnson, Wash.	Niedringhaus
Bolleau	Doutrich	Kading	Norton, N. J.
Boland	Doxey	Kahn	O'Connor
Bolton	Drewry	Keller	Oliver, N. Y.
Briggs	Driver	Kelly, Ill.	Overton
Britten	Eaton, Colo.	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, Ga.
Brumm	Eaton, N. J.	Kemp	Parker, N. Y.
Brunner	Englebright	Kendal	Parsons
Buckbee	Erk	Kennedy	Partridge
Burdick	Evans, Calif.	Ketcham	Peavey
Butler	Fernandez	Kinzer	Perkins
Campbell, Iowa	Fleisinger	Kleberg	Person
Campbell, Pa.	Finley	Kopp	Pettengill
Carley	Fish	Kurtz	Pittenger
Carter, Calif.	Fitzpatrick	Larrabee	Prall
Carter, Wyo.	Foss	Leavitt	Pratt, Harcourt J.
Caviochia	Free	Leibach	Pratt, Ruth
Celler	Gasque	Lichtenwalner	Purnell
Chavez	Gavagan	Lindsay	Ramsayer
Chindblom	Goldsborough	Loneragan	Ransley
Chiperfield	Goss	Loofbourow	Reed, N. Y.
Clancy	Granfield	Lovette	Reid, Ill.
Clarke, N. Y.	Green	Luce	Reilly
Cochran, Pa.	Greenwood	McCormack	Rich
Cole, Iowa	Griffin	McFadden	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Md.	Griswold	McGugin	Rogers, N. H.
Colton	Hadley	McKeown	Rudd
Condon	Hall, Ill.	McLaughlin	Sanders, N. Y.
Connolly	Hall, Miss.	McLeod	Sanders, Tex.
Cooke	Hancock, N. Y.	McMillan	Sandlin
Cooper, Tenn.	Hancock, N. C.	McSwain	Schafer
Corning	Hardy	Maas	Schuetz

Seger
Seiberling
Shott
Shreve
Slrovich
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Va.
Snell
Snow
Somers, N. Y.
Stafford
Stalker

Stevenson
Stewart
Stokes
Strong, Pa.
Stull
Sullivan, N. Y.
Summers, Wash.
Sutphin
Swanson
Sweeney
Swick
Swing

Taber
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Thatcher
Thomason
Tierney
Timberlake
Tinkham
Treadway
Turpin
Wason
Watson

Weeks
Welch, Calif.
Whitley
Wigglesworth
Wilson
Wingo
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolfenden
Wolverton
Wyant
Yates

NAYS—151

Allgood
Almon
Amle
Andresen
Ayres
Bankhead
Barton
Blanton
Boehne
Bowman
Brand, Ga.
Brand, Ohio
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Burch
Burtness
Busby
Byrns
Canfield
Cannon
Carden
Cartwright
Christgau
Christopherson
Clague
Clark, N. C.
Cochran, Mo.
Collins
Cooper, Ohio
Cox
Crisp
Cross
Cresser
Davis
Dickinson
Dies
Disney
Doughton

Dowell
Elzey
Evans, Mont.
Fishburne
Flannagan
Frear
French
Fullbright
Fuller
Gambrill
Garber
Gilbert
Gilchrist
Gillen
Glover
Gregory
Guyer
Haines
Hall, N. Dak.
Hare
Harlan
Hastings
Haugen
Hill, Ala.
Hill, Wash.
Hoch
Hogg, W. Va.
Holaday
Holladay
Hope
Howard
Huddleston
Hull, Morton D.
Jacobsen
Jenkins
Johnson, Mo.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones

Ramspeck
Rankin
Rayburn
Robinson
Romjue
Sabath
Schneider
Selvig
Simmons
Sinclair
Smith, W. Va.
Sparks
Spence
Steagall
Strong, Kans.
Summers, Tex.
Swank
Tanner
Taylor, Colo.
Thurston
Underhill
Underwood
Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Warren
Weaver
Welsh, Pa.
West
White
Whittington
Williams, Mo.
Williams, Tex.
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Ind.
Woodruff
Woodrum
Wright

NOT VOTING—45

Abernethy
Andrews, N. Y.
Auf der Heide
Beck
Bohn
Boylan
Browning
Cable
Cary
Chapman
Chase
Collier

Connery
Crowther
De Priest
Dominick
Drane
Dyer
Eslick
Estep
Freeman
Fulmer
Garrett
Gibson

Gifford
Golder
Goodwin
Hogg, Ind.
Hollister
Igoe
Lamneck
Lankford, Va.
Lea
Mitchell
Murphy
Owen

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Eslick (against).
Mr. Tilson (for) with Mr. Browning (against).
Mr. Auf der Heide (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).
Mr. Hollister (for) with Mr. Goodwin (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Tucker with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Bohn.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Hogg of Indiana.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Cable.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Dominick with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Ragon with Mr. Williamson.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Igoe with Mr. De Priest.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Pou with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Shallenberger with Mr. Lankford of Virginia.
Mr. Yon with Mr. Chase.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. Was the citizens' military training camps included in this amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry at this stage, when the amendment has been read and the roll has been called. To be frank, the Chair could not answer, because the Chair is not familiar with the details of the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. GIFFORD, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HOLLISTER, is absent. Were he present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, after line 2, insert:

"CITIZENS' MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS"

"For furnishing, at the expense of the United States, to warrant officers, enlisted men, and civilians attending training camps maintained under the provisions of section 47d of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 442), uniforms, including altering, fitting, washing, and cleaning when necessary, subsistence, or subsistence allowances, and transportation, or transportation allowances, as prescribed in said section 47d, as amended; for such expenditures as are authorized by said section 47d as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of said camps, including recruiting and advertising therefor, and the cost of maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles; for expenses incident to the use, including upkeep and depreciation costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the War Department; for gymnasium and athletic supplies (not exceeding \$20,000); for mileage, reimbursement of traveling expenses, or allowance in lieu thereof as authorized by law, for officers of the Regular Army and Organized Reserves traveling on duty in connection with citizens' military training camps; for purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; for medical and hospital treatment, subsistence, and transportation, in case of injury in line of duty, of members of the citizens' military training camps and for transportation and burial of remains of any such members who die while undergoing training or hospital treatment, as provided in the act of April 26, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 10, secs. 454, 455); in all, \$2,603,624: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be used for the training of any person in the first year or lowest course, who shall have reached his twenty-fourth birthday before the date of enrollment: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated elsewhere in this act except for printing and binding and for pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army shall be used for expenses in connection with citizens' military training camps: *Provided further*, That uniforms and other equipment or matériel furnished in accordance with law for use at citizens' military training camps shall be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the War Department without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expense incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or matériel furnished in accordance with law for use at citizens' military training camps from stocks under control of the War Department be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 141, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—243

Adkins	Briggs	Cochran, Pa.	Delaney
Aldrich	Britten	Cole, Iowa	DeRouen
Allen	Brumm	Cole, Md.	Dickstein
Andrew, Mass.	Brunner	Colton	Dieterich
Andrews, N. Y.	Buckbee	Condon	Douglas, Ariz.
Arentz	Burdick	Connolly	Douglass, Mass.
Bacharach	Butler	Cooke	Doutrich
Bachmann	Campbell, Iowa	Cooper, Tenn.	Dowell
Bacon	Campbell, Pa.	Corning	Doxey
Baldrige	Carden	Coyle	Drewry
Barbour	Carley	Cral	Driver
Beam	Carter, Calif.	Crowe	Eaton, Colo.
Beedy	Carter, Wyo.	Crump	Eaton, N. J.
Black	Cavichia	Culkin	Englebright
Bland	Celler	Cullen	Erk
Bloom	Chavez	Curry	Evans, Calif.
Bolleau	Chindblom	Dallinger	Fernandez
Boland	Chipherfield	Darrow	Fiesinger
Bolton	Clarke, N. Y.	Davenport	Finley

Fish	Keller	Montague	Somers, N. Y.
Fitzpatrick	Kelly, Ill.	Montet	Spence
Foss	Kelly, Pa.	Mouser	Stalker
Free	Kemp	Nelson, Me.	Stewart
Gasque	Kennedy	Niedringhaus	Stokes
Gavagan	Ketcham	Nolan	Strong, Kans.
Gilchrist	Kinzer	Norton, N. J.	Strong, Pa.
Goldsborough	Kleberg	O'Connor	Stull
Goss	Kopp	Oliver, N. Y.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Granfield	Kurtz	Overton	Summers, Wash.
Green	Lambertson	Parker, Ga.	Sutphin
Greenwood	Lankford, Ga.	Parker, N. Y.	Swanson
Griffin	Larrabee	Parsons	Sweeney
Griswold	Leavitt	Partridge	Swick
Hadley	Lehlbach	Person	Swing
Hall, Ill.	Lichtenwalner	Pettengill	Taber
Hall, Miss.	Lindsay	Pittenger	Taylor, Tenn.
Hancock, N. Y.	Loneragan	Prall	Temple
Hancock, N. C.	Loofbourn	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Thatcher
Hardy	Lovette	Pratt, Ruth	Thomason
Harlan	Luce	Purnell	Tierney
Hartley	Ludlow	Ransley	Timberlake
Hawley	McCormack	Reed, N. Y.	Tinkham
Hess	McFadden	Reid, Ill.	Treadway
Hogg, W. Va.	McGugin	Reilly	Turpin
Holmes	McKeown	Rich	Underhill
Hooper	McLaughlin	Rogers, Mass.	Underwood
Hope	McLeod	Rogers, N. H.	Wason
Hopkins	McMillan	Rudd	Watson
Hornor	McSwain	Sanders, N. Y.	Weeks
Horr	Maas	Sanders, Tex.	Weich, Calif.
Houston, Del.	Magrady	Sandlin	Whitley
Hull, William E.	Major	Schafer	Wigglesworth
James	Maloney	Schuetz	Wilson
Jeffers	Manlove	Seger	Wingo
Jenkins	Mansfield	Seiberling	Withrow
Johnson, Ill.	Mapes	Shott	Wolcott
Johnson, Okla.	Martin, Mass.	Shreve	Wolfenden
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Oreg.	Sirovich	Wolverton
Johnson, Wash.	May	Smith, Idaho	Wyant
Kading	Mead	Snell	Yates
Kahn	Millard	Snow	

NAYS—141

Allgood	Disney	Kniffin	Robinson
Almon	Doughton	Knutson	Romjue
Amle	Elzey	Kunz	Sabath
Andresen	Evans, Mont.	Kvale	Schneider
Arnold	Fishburne	LaGuardia	Selvig
Ayres	Flannagan	Lambeth	Simmons
Bankhead	Frear	Lanham	Sinclair
Barton	French	Larsen	Smith, Va.
Blanton	Fulbright	Lewis	Smith, W. Va.
Boehne	Fuller	Lithicum	Sparks
Bowman	Fulmer	Lozier	Stafford
Brand, Ga.	Gambrill	McClintic, Okla.	Stegall
Brand, Ohio	Garber	McClintock, Ohio	Stevenson
Buchanan	Gilbert	McDuffie	Sumners, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gillen	McReynolds	Swank
Burch	Glover	Michener	Tarver
Burtess	Gregory	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Busby	Guyer	Milligan	Thurston
Byrns	Haines	Moble	Vinson, Ga.
Canfield	Hall, N. Dak.	Moore, Ky.	Vinson, Ky.
Cannon	Hare	Moore, Ohio	Warren
Cartwright	Hastings	Morehead	Weaver
Christgau	Haugen	Nelson, Mo.	Welsh, Pa.
Christopherson	Hill, Ala.	Nelson, Wis.	West
Clague	Hill, Wash.	Norton, Nebr.	White
Clark, N. C.	Hoch	Oliver, Ala.	Whittington
Cochran, Mo.	Holaday	Palmisano	Williams, Mo.
Collins	Howard	Parks	Williams, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio	Huddleston	Patman	Wood, Ga.
Cox	Hull, Morton D.	Patterson	Wood, Ind.
Crisp	Jacobsen	Peavey	Woodruff
Cross	Johnson, Mo.	Polk	Woodrum
Crosser	Johnson, Tex.	Rainey	Wright
Davis	Jones	Ramseyer	
Dickinson	Karch	Ramspeck	
Dies	Kerr	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—48

Abernethy	Connery	Golder	Owen
Auf der Helde	Crowther	Goodwin	Perkins
Beck	De Priest	Hart	Pou
Bohn	Dominick	Hogg, Ind.	Ragon
Boylan	Drane	Hollister	Rayburn
Browning	Dyer	Igoe	Shallenberger
Cable	Eslick	Kendall	Shannon
Cary	Estep	Lamneck	Sullivan, Pa.
Chapman	Freeman	Lankford, Va.	Tilson
Chase	Garrett	Lea	Tucker
Clancy	Gibson	Mitchell	Williamson
Collier	Gifford	Murphy	Yon

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Eslick (against).
 Mr. Tilson (for) with Mr. Browning (against).
 Mr. Auf der Helde (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).
 Mr. Hollister (for) with Mr. Goodwin (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Tucker with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Bohn.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Hogg of Indiana.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Cable.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Dominick with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Ragon with Mr. Williamson.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Kendall.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Shallenberger with Mr. Lankford of Virginia.
Mr. Yon with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Pou with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Igou.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GIFFORD, is absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I can not qualify; but if permitted to vote, I would vote "aye."

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is unavoidably absent; if present, he would vote "aye" on the three amendments that have been voted upon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is any gentleman opposed to the bill in its entirety?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to certain features of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That does not give the gentleman from Texas any priority over the gentleman from California. If any Member of the House is opposed to the bill in its entirety, he is entitled to preference.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. I voted against every amendment, and I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARBOUR moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 10, line 15, commencing with the colon, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Page 8, line 19, strike out "\$27,209,927" and insert "\$31,833,427."

Page 8, line 23, strike out "\$8,356,200" and insert "\$8,545,011."

Page 9, line 4, strike out "\$1,914,948" and insert "\$9,447,323."

Page 9, line 14, strike out "\$4,648,006" and insert "\$6,281,824."

Page 9, line 15, strike out "\$5,122,479" and insert "\$5,928,389."

Page 9, line 22, strike out "\$133,257,790" and insert "\$137,042,204."

Page 10, line 1, strike out "\$132,457,790" and insert "\$136,242,204."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the motion is not in order, that the House has already voted on the proposal submitted to the House by the gentleman from California and adopted by the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that the McSwain amendment was adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as a part of a paragraph. The McSwain amendment has been voted upon by the House of Representatives since the committee has risen. It has become a part and parcel of the bill by action of the House.

The gentleman from California now seeks to change the provision by adopting only a portion of the paragraph which contains the McSwain amendment and not all of the paragraph, and to that extent the motion to recommit of the gentleman from California is out of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the proposed amendment, which is made up of quite a number of items, changes the items which were included by virtue of the McSwain amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It eliminates the McSwain amendment along with other provisions of the bill.

The Chair will hear the gentleman from California on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask further if it changes all of the provisions of the McSwain amendment or only a portion of them?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have the McSwain amendment, even though it is adopted by the House, again read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the McSwain amendment will be again read.

Answering the gentleman's further parliamentary inquiry, the proposed motion to recommit eliminates from the bill the McSwain amendment along with other provisions in those paragraphs to which the McSwain amendment was adopted as a perfecting amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The entire McSwain amendment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the Chair has answered that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is made because of that proposed action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

If there is no objection on the part of the House, the Chair will direct that the McSwain amendment be read. There was a request that such be done.

Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the McSwain amendment is long and involved, and it would be very difficult for the House to follow it. Everybody knows what it is. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, a motion to recommit is a direction to the committee having had the bill in charge to report the bill back to the House with certain amendments. The amendments which are thus reported back to the House by the committee stand exactly upon the same footing as any other amendment offered to a bill and passed upon either by the House or by the Committee of the Whole.

In the present case the McSwain amendment, so-called, was adopted, beginning in line 11, page 11, with the word "convene," and was a perfecting amendment to the language which it is proposed by the motion to recommit to strike out. A motion to strike out is always in order following a perfecting amendment. In fact, the perfecting amendment must have consideration before the motion to strike out is voted upon.

I submit to the Chair that this is not the ordinary case where it is sought to get further action by the House upon an amendment which has already been adopted by seeking to strike out that amendment itself or by seeking to amend such an amendment. But, as I have stated, this is a motion to strike out the text of the bill, together with the perfecting amendment, which, of course, was adopted both by the Committee of the Whole and by the House before the motion to strike out would have been in order.

The remaining language in the motion, I will say to the Chair, can not be involved in any objection because it merely proposes to increase amounts of appropriation which are already in the bill and were not changed by amendments in the Committee of the Whole or in the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the so-called McSwain amendment provides the machinery to carry out the specific mandate of the bill. Every Member of the House was fully protected on a motion to recommit, particularly the gentleman from California. Had he asked for a separate vote on the McSwain amendment, and if the separate vote had been voted down, then he could carry out his purpose by a motion to recommit to increase the appropriations in order to avoid the discharge of 2,000 officers. But the McSwain amendment was approved by the House; it was adopted by the House when the Speaker submitted all of the amendments en gros, and therefore, what the gentleman from California is now seeking to do is to make another appeal to the House and have the House reverse itself on something upon which it has just voted. Whether it is a part of the entire motion to recommit or not is not controlling if it is an integral part of a specific proposition. For instance, without the McSwain amendment, Mr. Speaker, the existing number of officers could be left intact, even though we did not appropriate sufficiently for them. That is not the gist of it. What the gentleman from California seeks to do, under his motion to recommit, is to strike from the bill the elimination of 2,000 officers. I submit that the motion to recommit is not in order because the means whereby these officers may be eliminated have been adopted by the House. As I said before, the gentleman from California could have obtained a separate vote on that, and had the House voted that out of the bill, then his motion to recommit would have been in order, but under the parliamentary situation, the House having passed upon that part of the bill he can not now attempt to reverse the action of the House by a motion to recommit. The point of order should be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The Chair regrets that he was not here during the consideration of this bill, but was presiding over the Ways and Means Committee and, therefore, is not familiar with what took place in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the bill was being considered. The Chair has tried to acquaint himself as best he could in the last few moments with what transpired.

The Chair is advised that in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union a perfecting amendment was adopted to the paragraph known as the McSwain amendment. The bill was reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the House, the House has agreed to the amendments, and has ordered the bill engrossed and read a third time.

The question is whether a motion to recommit, as offered by the gentleman from California, is in order which seeks to change something that the House has agreed to.

The motion to recommit was placed in the rule to give a substantial privilege to the minority of the House—I do not mean any political minority but a minority of the House—so as to give them a chance to go on record as to legislation.

In the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union there is no roll-call vote, so that the only opportunity that a minority may have to go on record is by means of a motion to recommit in the House. If the motion to recommit of the gentleman from California sought simply to eliminate from the bill the McSwain amendment, it would not be in order, because the question of estoppel would apply. When the House has acted on a matter, it must be res adjudicata. However, as the Chair understands the proposition, the McSwain amendment was adopted as a perfecting amendment to the paragraph. The motion to recommit of the gentleman from California proposes to strike out a substantial portion of the paragraph comprehending the McSwain amendment. Under the general rules of the House, where a motion is made to strike out a paragraph, a perfecting amendment changing the paragraph is preferential and the vote is first taken on the perfecting amendment. If the perfecting amendment is adopted, then it is in order to move to strike out the entire paragraph, notwithstanding the House or the committee has adopted a perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

The Chair thinks that the same rule applies to a motion to recommit where it is proposed in such a motion to strike out a paragraph or a portion of a paragraph which may have been perfected by amendments.

The Chair is therefore constrained to rule that the point of order is not good, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute motion to recommit.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California did not move the previous question, and the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Undoubtedly, if the previous question had been moved and sustained, no substitute motion to recommit would be in order, but the previous question was not moved, and the gentleman from Texas is within his parliamentary rights.

The Clerk will report the substitute motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit by Mr. BLANTON: Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments, to-wit: On page 16, line 4, before the period, insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to the permanent change of station of any commissioned officer of the Army except (1) officers appointed to and relieved from positions that are filled by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (2) officers detailed to and from Army schools as students, (3) military attachés, (4) officers ordered to and from duty in the Canal Zone and in the Philippines, and (5) officers ordered to replace officers who die or may be separated from the active list."

On page 15, line 20, strike out "\$4,126,865" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,126,865."

On page 52, line 10, before the word "Members," insert "not to exceed 10,000."

On page 56, line 23, after the word "instruction," insert "not to exceed 36,000."

Mr. BLANTON. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the substitute.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit and all amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question on his substitute motion and on the original motion of the gentleman from California; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] makes a point of order against the substitute of the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the rule of practice and procedure and decorum which has been established by the Speaker of the House that the Chair will not recognize anyone in the well of the House; and I will say for that reason—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not consider that point. The present Speaker pro tempore has made no such ruling.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the points of order: First, that the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as a substitute for the motion to recommit of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] is not germane to the motion of the gentleman from California; secondly, that it contains legislative matter which is not in order upon an appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair does not feel compelled to pass on the question of whether the substitute of the gentleman from Texas is germane to the original motion to recommit of the gentleman from California or not. The gentleman from California made a motion to recommit dealing with certain features of the bill. The previous question was not ordered. The gentleman from Texas has offered a substitute with instructions as to other features of the bill, and the Chair thinks it is

clearly within the province of the House to pass on which one of the motions to recommit they desire to pass upon and will, of course, have a chance to pass on both of them. If the Blanton amendment as a substitute is adopted for the Barbour motion to recommit, that would eliminate the instructions in the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], and the question would come as to whether the House desired to adopt the instruction of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the Chair rule on the point of order as to the motion containing legislative matter on an appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no point of order made on that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I made that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; I made that point of order, and I thought I had made it quite distinctly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon, but he did not hear that part of his point of order. The Chair will say, as he caught the reading of the motion to recommit, the legislative part of it is a limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. It is both a limitation and comes within the Holman rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is a limitation, and the question is on the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both motions to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the substitute motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question of ordering the yeas and nays was taken and 47 Members arose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Forty-seven Members have arisen, and it requires, according to the last vote, 77. The Constitution provides for one-fifth of the Members present. Forty-seven is not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 90 ayes and 200 noes.

So the substitute motion to recommit was lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the motion to recommit by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 202, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]
YEAS—182

Adkins	Carley	Douglas, Ariz.	Horr
Aldrich	Carter, Calif.	Douglass, Mass.	Houston, Del.
Allen	Carter, Wyo.	Doutrich	Hull, William E.
Andrew, Mass.	Caviechia	Drewry	James
Andrews, N. Y.	Celler	Eaton, Colo.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Arentz	Chavez	Eaton, N. J.	Johnson, Wash.
Bacharach	Chindblom	Englebright	Kahn
Bachmann	Chipperfield	Erk	Kelly, Pa.
Bacon	Clague	Evans, Calif.	Kemp
Baldrige	Clancy	Finley	Kennedy
Barbour	Clarke, N. Y.	Fish	Ketcham
Beam	Cochran, Pa.	Fitzpatrick	Kinzer
Beedy	Cole, Iowa	Foss	Kieberg
Black	Connolly	Free	Kurtz
Bland	Cooke	Gavagan	Leibach
Bloom	Corning	Goss	Lichtenwalner
Bolleau	Coyle	Griffin	Lindsay
Boland	Crall	Hadley	Lonergan
Bolton	Crump	Hall, Miss.	Lonergan
Bowman	Culkin	Hancock, N. Y.	Lovette
Briggs	Cullen	Hardy	Luca
Britten	Curry	Hartley	McCormack
Brumm	Dallinger	Hawley	McPadden
Brunner	Darrow	Hess	McGugin
Buckbee	Davenport	Hogg, Ind.	McLaughlin
Burdick	Delaney	Holmes	McLeod
Butler	Dickstein	Hooper	Maas
Campbell, Pa.	Dieterich	Hopkins	Magrady

Manlove	Perkins	Smith, Idaho	Timberlake
Mapes	Person	Smith, Va.	Tinkham
Martin, Mass.	Pittenger	Snell	Treadway
Martin, Oreg.	Prall	Somers, N. Y.	Turpin
Michener	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Stafford	Wason
Millard	Pratt, Ruth	Stalker	Watson
Montague	Purnell	Stewart	Weeks
Montet	Ransley	Stokes	Welch, Calif.
Mouser	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	White
Niedringhaus	Reid, Ill.	Stull	Whitley
Nolan	Rogers, Mrs.	Sullivan, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Norton, Mrs.	Rogers	Sutphin	Wolcott
O'Connor	Rudd	Swick	Wolfenden
Oliver, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.	Swing	Wolverton
Palmsano	Schafer	Taber	Wyant
Parker, Ga.	Schuetz	Temple	Yates
Parker, N. Y.	Seger	Thomason	
Parsons	Sirovich	Tierney	

NAYS—202

Allgood	Fishburne	Kerr	Rankin
Almon	Flannagan	Kniffin	Rayburn
Amile	Frear	Knutson	Reilly
Andresen	French	Kopp	Rich
Arnold	Fulbright	Kunz	Robinson
Ayres	Fuller	Kvale	Romjue
Bankhead	Fulmer	LaGuardia	Sabath
Barton	Gambrill	Lambertson	Sanders, Tex.
Blanton	Garber	Lambeth	Sandlin
Boehne	Gasque	Lanham	Schneider
Brand, Ga.	Gilbert	Lankford, Ga.	Selberling
Brand, Ohio	Gilchrist	Larrabee	Selvig
Buchanan	Gillen	Larsen	Shott
Bulwinkle	Glover	Leavitt	Simmons
Burch	Goldsborough	Lewis	Sinclair
Burtness	Granfield	Linthicum	Smith, W. Va.
Busby	Green	Lozier	Snow
Byrns	Greenwood	Ludlow	Sparks
Campbell, Iowa	Gregory	McClintic, Okla.	Spence
Carnfield	Griswold	McClintock, Ohio	Stegall
Cannon	Guyer	McDuffie	Stevenson
Carden	Haines	McKeown	Strong, Kans.
Cartwright	Hall, Ill.	McReynolds	Summers, Wash.
Christgau	Hall, N. Dak.	McSwain	Sumners, Tex.
Christopherson	Hancock, N. C.	Major	Swank
Clark, N. C.	Hare	Maloney	Swanson
Cochran, Mo.	Harlan	May	Sweeney
Cole, Md.	Hart	Mead	Tarver
Collins	Hastings	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Colton	Haugen	Milligan	Taylor, Tenn.
Condon	Hill, Ala.	Mobley	Thatcher
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Ky.	Thurston
Cooper, Tenn.	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Underhill
Cox	Hogg, W. Va.	Morehead	Underwood
Crisp	Holiday	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Cross	Hope	Nelson, Me.	Vinson, Ky.
Crosser	Hornor	Nelson, Mo.	Warren
Crowe	Howard	Nelson, Wis.	Weaver
Davis	Huddleston	Norton, Nebr.	West
DeRouen	Hull, Morton D.	Oliver, Ala.	Whittington
Dickinson	Jacobson	Overton	Williams, Mo.
Dies	Jeffers	Parks	Williams, Tex.
Disney	Jenkins	Partridge	Wilson
Doughton	Johnson, Mo.	Patman	Wingo
Dowell	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson	Withrow
Doxey	Johnson, Tex.	Peavey	Wood, Ga.
Driver	Jones	Pettengill	Woodruff
Elizey	Kading	Polk	Woodrum
Evans, Mont.	Karch	Ratney	Wright
Fernandez	Keller	Ramsayer	
Fiesinger	Kelly, Ill.	Ramspeck	

NOT VOTING—49

Abernethy	De Priest	Igoe	Shallenberger
Auf der Heide	Dominick	Johnson, Ill.	Shannon
Beck	Drane	Kendall	Shreve
Bohn	Dyer	Lamneck	Sullivan, Pa.
Boylan	Estlick	Lankford, Va.	Tilson
Browning	Estep	Lea	Tucker
Cable	Freeman	McMillan	Welsh, Pa.
Cary	Garrett	Mansfield	Williamson
Chapman	Gibson	Mitchell	Wood, Ind.
Chase	Gifford	Murphy	Yon
Coiller	Golder	Owen	
Connery	Goodwin	Pou	
Crowther	Hollister	Ragon	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Estlick (against).
Mr. Tilson (for) with Mr. Browning (against).
Mr. Auf der Heide (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).
Mr. Hollister (for) with Mr. Goodwin (against).
Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. Ragon (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Tucker with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Bohn.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Cable.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Dominick with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Freeman.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Beck.
 Mr. Shallenberger with Mr. Lankford of Virginia.
 Mr. Yon with Mr. Chase.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wood of Indiana.
 Mr. Pou with Mr. Kendall.
 Mr. Connery with Mr. Williamson.
 Mr. Igoe with Mr. De Priest.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. COLLINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—THE ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hate war. I should like to see world disarmament. But I want it to be world disarmament with emphasis on the word "world." I do not believe in destroying our national defense and allowing the rest of the world to be armed. I do not believe in any nation having a greater army than our own—in any nation having a more effective army than our own. We have been very magnanimous it seems to me. We have reduced our Army and Navy since the World War below treaty strength. The other nations have not.

I favor a citizens' army, an army built in time of trouble around trained officers. That is why I favor leaving in this bill every appropriation for the citizens' military training camp, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the training of reserve officers.

During the last war we commissioned many officers whose only qualifications were an A. B. or B. S. degree. They were wonderful boys. Some of them could do logarithms in their heads; but that knowledge is not sufficient to make an officer. The ability to find the cube root of a barrel of pork or find the longitude west of Greenwich does not help a man to keep his head and handle men under fire or even on the parade ground. It does not teach him how to train others to do squads right, to shoot, or to take down and set up a machine gun under difficulties.

The military science is an exact science. One that does not permit of mistakes. Mistakes do not mean merely a money loss. Military mistakes mean death to men. In Italy, according to the press some months ago, each boy in the schools is required at the age of 7 to begin training with a wooden replica of the army rifle. If you abolish the citizens' military training camps and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, you are going to send our boys out to fight against boys trained from the age of 7. Boys without training you are going to send forth to be crucified on the altar of penuriousness.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], in his speech at the opening of this debate, told us that this was the richest Nation on earth. He should know. He has been here in this House many years. He has been chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is so important that he could take the floor and state to this House that he spoke for the President of these United States. I think we can take his word that we are the richest Nation in the world. If we are the richest Nation we are being meanly penurious in taking from our boys this training that may in the future save their lives on the field of battle.

As a Nation, with the exception of a few religious sects and certain organizations of pacifists, we hold that the obligation to bear arms in defense of the Nation goes hand in hand with the obligation of citizenship. If it does, then there is an obligation on the part of the Nation to train the youth to arms. We are to a certain extent fulfilling that obligation through these two arms created in the national defense act.

It is the European plan that the sons of the nobility, the aristocrats, the sons of wealth shall be officers, and the private shall come from the sons of the poor. My idea of an army is a democratic army. The European idea is that they must have a large standing army. The American plan is for a citizen army based on a nucleus of trained men, ready, willing, and capable of training others rapidly in time of war. The son of the farmer, of the laborer, of the section

foreman—the capable intelligent youth whose only drawback is the lack of a college education—has as much right to be an officer as the son of a more fortunately situated parent. He may not be able to get the training in college to qualify him. He can get it in the citizens' military training camps and the schools of the Organized Reserve units. This vast majority of the boys of the Nation should not be discriminated against.

Last winter, at the suggestion of the President, Congress gave a moratorium of more than two hundred and fifty million to European nations. I voted against that measure. Those nations to whom we gave the moratorium were spending millions for armament. Every one of them was maintaining a larger land force than ours. Now we are trying to make up that loss of a quarter of a billion dollars through all kinds of so-called economy measures. The best economy would have been to have kept the money in the first place and not have contributed that amount to financing the armament of Europe.

I voted against that contribution to Europe, and I will not now favor making up the deficit so created by taking the amount from the Budget for our own national defense. I do not expect those nations whose armament we are financing through moratoriums to ever use that armament in our behalf. They may use it against us.

There are ways to cut the expenses without sacrificing national security in a time of world unrest. We have already cut it more than five hundred and sixty million under the amount that the President gave us in his Budget last December as the irreducible minimum and we will cut it more.

The private's life is at stake; he prefers to be led by a trained man, a man fully equipped, a man with a knowledge of the handling of troops and men and munitions, a man in whom he has confidence. He not only prefers it, he has a right to expect it. Congress can declare war. By a system of draft you gentlemen can force him into service whether he wants to go or not. But you have no right that you can justify, either by the rules of reason or law of rectitude, to send him into war untrained himself and under untrained officers. The only alternative to prevent the injustice is to provide sufficient money for our citizens' military training camps and Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Justice to the Nation and justice to the private both demand it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
 Mr. BROWNING, for four days, on account of important business.

Mr. ESLICK, for the day, on account of illness.

Mr. KENNEDY, for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

REREFERENCE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 11184 be rereferred to the Committee on Roads from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given me authority to make this request, which is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Roads and to the ranking member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill was introduced, it was considered a private bill, having to do with a bridge across the St. Clair River at Port Huron, Mich. Since that time it has been determined to be of a quite general character. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONTROLLED EXPANSION OF THE CURRENCY AND THE PAYMENT
OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Clerk's desk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 220, which provides a rule for the consideration of H. R. 7726, a bill providing for the expansion of the currency and the payment of the adjusted-service certificates. The Committee on Ways and Means made an adverse report on this bill. Thirteen members of that committee signed the adverse report and 11 members signed the minority report. The minority report contains a clear, logical and unanswerable argument in favor of the full cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates. The report recommends that section 2 of H. R. 7726 be stricken out and the following amendment be substituted in lieu thereof:

Sec. 2. Payment of the face value of the adjusted-service certificates under section 509 or 510 of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, shall be paid in Treasury notes.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue United States notes to the extent required to make the payments herein authorized. Such notes shall be legal tender for public and private debts and printed in the same size, of the same denominations, and of the same form as Treasury notes, omitting the reference to any Federal reserve bank.

He shall place such notes in the Federal reserve banks, subject to the order of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to be used for the purposes of this act.

He shall issue a like amount of United States bonds bearing 3½ per cent interest payable semiannually, with coupons attached, and such bonds shall be due and payable in 20 years from the date of issue, subject to the right of redemption after 10 years.

These bonds shall be deposited in the Federal reserve banks, as the agents of the United States, in approximate proportion to their current assets at the date of the passage of this act.

In the event that the purchasing power of the dollar in the wholesale commodity markets, as ascertained by the United States Department of Labor, shall at any time fall as much as 2 per cent below the average value of the year 1926, the Federal Reserve Board, by resolution in writing, may direct the sale to the public of such portions of said bonds as may from time to time be necessary to restore the purchasing power of the dollar to the normal standard of 1926.

Such currency received for such bonds shall be exchanged for the notes hereby authorized to be issued and they shall be returned to the Secretary of the Treasury for cancellation.

The bonds will not be sold and will therefore not draw interest unless commodity prices return to the 1926 level. This section completely answers the argument of our opponents that we are proposing uncontrolled inflation. We are proposing controlled expansion of the currency.

I expect to follow the recommendation in the minority report. If 144 other Members of the House sign the motion to discharge the Rules Committee—53 have already signed—the rule will come up for consideration the second Monday in June, the 13th. If the rule is adopted by the House, four hours' debate will be allowed on the bill H. R. 7726, and then the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule and be subject to amendments. At that time I expect to offer the amendment to section 2 of the bill as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, and which is known as the Owen plan. I have prepared and introduced a bill which embodies this amendment. It is H. R. 11992, but consideration on this bill can not be forced, because it has been introduced less than 30 days. H. R. 11992 is the same as H. R. 1, with the Owen amendment added.

The Committee on Rules has before it our application for a favorable report on House Resolution 220. If a favorable report is made, we will get consideration much earlier than June 13. I do not believe the Members of Congress want to go back to their respective homes without making an effort to afford substantial relief to the plain people.

I hope every Member of the House will read the minority views of the members of the Ways and Means Committee. The committee hearings are also very interesting.

ADDRESS OF HON. S. D. McREYNOLDS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein an

address delivered by my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], over the radio last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I incorporate as a part of my remarks a radio speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. S. D. McREYNOLDS, whom we all know is one of the most able, earnest, and influential Members of the Congress in his advocacy of economy. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I have had occasion to know of the value of his services along this line. The speech is as follows:

When Congress convened here in December we fully appreciated the serious condition confronting this country; and although the House was organized by the Democrats, speaking as one of them, it was our purpose to cooperate in every way possible with the administration in enacting that character of legislation which we thought would be beneficial to the country and relieve the most distressful conditions. Following that policy the moratorium resolution was passed at the request of the President. We have also passed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, with an appropriation of \$500,000,000, and with an expansion of some \$2,000,000,000, which has been used, and is being used, for the purpose of stabilizing banks and railroads. Congress has also passed a hundred and twenty-five million dollar appropriation for the Federal land banks, which had for its purpose the right to grant extension of loans to farmers who had been unable to meet their obligations on account of the distressed condition throughout the country. But it seems that this has had but little effect.

Congress has also passed the Glass-Steagall bill, which, among other things, permits banks to take bonds, drawing interest, to the Federal reserve bank and issue currency for the face value thereof, with the proper discount charge. While it may be that these acts have been of some benefit in restoring confidence and maintaining our banking systems, yet a little, if any, has seeped down to the laboring or producing class, where prosperity must begin. Next came the tax measure, for which the House has been criticized very severely on account of our action thereon. This bill was reported as a nonpartisan measure and leaders on both sides of the House advocated the same. It provided for a general manufacturers' sales tax, to which many of us had been opposed in the House for many years, and I plead guilty to the charge of being one of the insurgents who aided in striking that measure from the bill. I have always believed that the tax burdens should fall heavier on those who are most able to pay. For many years there has been a strong fight made by certain interests to establish this form of taxation and thereby relieve the tax on incomes and inheritances. Naturally, it was the moneyed interests of this country who wished to shield themselves as much as possible in trying to procure this mode of taxation.

I opposed this manufacturers' sales tax because, first, if the tax could be passed on and was passed on to the purchaser, it would be paid by those least able to pay; second, there are thousands of manufacturing plants throughout this country who are merely battling for existence and who are patriotic enough to try to keep their men on the pay roll in order to support them and their families, although they are running in the red, who would not have been able, on account of very close competition, to have passed this tax on, and, therefore, would have had to close their plants and added thousands of others to the great army of unemployed throughout the United States. When we struck this sales tax from the tax bill we placed therein other articles of taxation that seemed to us just and fair, that would have raised the desired revenue for the purpose of balancing the Budget, according to the estimates of the Treasury Department, with the saving of some \$200,000,000 that has since passed the House.

The Members of the House fully appreciate the direful conditions existing in this country and the absolute necessity of cutting down expenses and economizing in every conceivable way that would not in any way interfere with the proper functions of the Government. Taking into consideration the economy bill, as passed by the House, and all other appropriations that have been made by the House, we have already reduced the appropriations for the fiscal year 1933 under that of 1932 nearly \$620,000,000, and we are not through yet. This is something like \$250,000,000 less than the President, through his Director of Budget, requested to be appropriated in his message to the House on December 7, 1931. In a statement made by the President in April, 1931, he did not at that time think that it would be necessary to even pass a tax bill during this session, although it was estimated that we would have a \$900,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year ending 1931.

The public must understand, as shown by the President's message on May 5, that all reductions must come from a sum not exceeding \$1,700,000,000; that the other appropriations are fixed charges. Since the President's message, in which he sent up his Director of Budget's report, he has asked for and secured \$625,000,000 in appropriations which was not included in his Director of Budget's estimate at that time.

There has much appeared in the press about the House failing to pass the economy bill that was reported to the House. This Economy Committee deserved great credit in the untiring efforts that they made trying to bring out some bill that would mean

many millions of savings to the Government. But so anxious were they to do this that they put items in this bill, to get them before the House, that were not agreed to by all members of that committee, and the result was that there was only one member of that committee, the chairman, who voted for and supported every measure therein contained.

For instance, while the committee reported consolidation of the Army and Navy, which it is admitted would have at least saved \$25,000,000, and estimated by the author, the Hon. JOE BYRNS, to have saved from fifty to one hundred million dollars, was bitterly opposed by the administration, and when this bill was up for consideration, the President's own private secretary, known as his political secretary, an ex-Member of the House, was on the floor of the House buttonholing Members of his own party against that measure, and which resulted in its defeat. The Economy Committee recommended 11 per cent flat cut, over \$1,000 exemption, of salaries, yet the administration and the Republican members of the Economy Committee fought this measure and undertook to substitute therefor what is known as the President's stagger plan. I merely recite these facts to show that there was no unanimity of action on the part of the committee or the administration in reference to all the items contained in this economy program. Personally, I voted for the consolidation of the Army and Navy, not only as a reduction of the expense of the Government but because I believe it would add to the efficiency and strength of our national defense.

I voted for the reduction of salaries; and after the committee had voted an exemption of \$2,500, which I voted against, I offered an amendment providing that there should be a reduction in salaries of 11 per cent from \$2,500 to \$3,500, 15 per cent from \$3,500 to \$5,000, 20 per cent from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and 25 per cent over and above that amount. This was defeated. Congressional salaries were cut 11 per cent over an exemption of \$2,500, but of course if my amendment had prevailed it would have been much more. I then thought, and still feel, that reduction in salaries should be greater in the higher brackets.

The President has complained that lobbyists have been in Washington "as thick as locusts." This may be true, and deserves the severest criticism, yet the same conditions existed when the Grundy tariff bill was passed in June, 1930, and which tariff bill has aided more in producing the distressful conditions in this country than any other act that has been passed by Congress in many years, yet we had no complaint from the Chief Executive at that time. Some two or three months ago the Expenditures Committee of the House had hearings and made investigations for the purpose of cutting down the expenses of the various departments, and in this investigation they had before them the heads of various departments, including Members of the Cabinet, and each and every one of them, from report made to me by members of that committee, stated that no reduction in expenses could be had in their departments.

How can we Members of Congress get this information, when there are thousands of offices and hundreds of thousands of employees in this Government, unless it comes to us through these departments, of which the administration is in control? Regardless of that fact, however, I am glad to say that the Committee on Appropriations have made many reductions, approved by the House, which will reduce the expenses of these departments. In the language of the Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, made on the floor of the House a few days ago: "I think it is a matter of supreme importance that the people of the country do know the truth about what this Congress is undertaking to do in the matter of economy, and I think the Congress of the United States ought to receive at the hands of the people the credit to which it is entitled for the earnest and diligent efforts as representatives of the American people in this body."

I have just spoken about lobbyists. But the greatest form of lobbying adopted in this country at the present time is that practiced by many organizations in writing form letters and sending them to your constituents and having them forward to you, oftentimes copied on their own local stationery. These letters come in by the thousands, and there was never a time in recent history when Members of Congress have been so flooded.

Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho, a few days ago stated on the floor of the House that he had been told that the cost of telegrams alone received by Members of Congress for days at a time would aggregate \$10,000 a day. Quoting him further:

"The Members of this Congress must not permit the selfish demands of individuals and groups who are asking for larger and still larger appropriations to blind them to the importance of scaling down the budgets that we are called upon to meet."

With this sentiment I fully agree. We must not only economize, and thereby aid in balancing the Budget at less expense to the taxpayers, but something must be done to relieve the situation that now exists in this country. The expenses of the Federal Government are too great and must be reduced, but the greatest burden of direct taxation upon the greatest number of people in this country is that of State, county, and municipalities. What must be done toward solving the economic conditions of this country? Money has become too high; it must be made cheaper; and it appears to me that the only way this can be done is by a sane and safe expansion of the currency. If we ever have prosperity in this country, it must commence at the bottom with the producing class.

The farmer is in a pitiful condition, unable to sell that which he grows, except for a pittance. If he owed \$1,000 three years ago,

to pay that now in commodities which he raises would cost him some three or four thousand dollars. This can not continue indefinitely. There must be some way to stabilize the dollar and stabilize it according to the price of commodities of about 1926. Senator BORAH stated Monday on the floor of the Senate: "The gold dollar is no longer an honest dollar; no longer a dollar to be trusted." The idea is that it fluctuates in value. We have tried to reach this condition in the House by the passage of the Gold-sborough bill, which means that the Federal Reserve Board shall buy up Government obligations and issue currency thereon until commodity prices reach a level of about 1926. This bill is indorsed by many of the most noted economists in this country. We must relieve this condition in some way. We must take care of our own people. There was never a time of recent years when conditions were so dreadful and the need was so great as at this present time. In my official career I have never felt the burdens and responsibilities so much, and everything that I can do toward economy in Government, toward that character of legislation that is sane and sound for general relief to the people of the United States, will be done.

I get numerous letters and telegrams daily from various places throughout the United States demanding economy in government, yet opposing any reduction in that proposition in which they are more vitally interested. So far as I am concerned I will close my eyes to these petty and personal requests and shall seek to do those things which I think is to the best interest of all the people of these United States and let the consequences be whatever they may. We have almost been led to the precipice by extravagance, and it is our duty to stay the hand and show the same character of patriotism that we would manifest during war, because this is a war against unemployment, against permitting the millions of men and women in this country to be out of employment, in destitute circumstances and children crying for bread.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement that I filed with the Committee on Rules with reference to H. R. 11677, including a statement and certain letters pertaining thereto and an exhibit referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, that is going a long way. The gentleman will have to modify his request. I object.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the question of national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the name of economy the very heart of our national defense is being attacked by the bill reported out by the committee of which Mr. COLLINS, of Mississippi, is chairman. They propose to:

(a) Discontinue the citizens' military training camps.

(b) Discontinue the Reserve Officers' Training Corps camps and to badly cripple our whole Reserve Officers' Training Corps system. Should this bill be passed as it is, such Reserve Officers' Training Corps units as those at the St. Joseph high schools would be discontinued.

(c) Discontinue the 14 days' pay for reserve officers' camps.

In 1920 we adopted our present national defense act. It provided that instead of maintaining a large standing army, we would maintain a large citizens' reserve which would serve to train our people not only in the fundamentals of defense but also in the principles of good citizenship. As a result we have for 12 years developed our National Guard and our Reserve Officers' Corps.

We all remember how unprepared we were in 1917. Thousands and thousands of lives were lost because we were unprepared. Also much valuable time was lost while we trained our men. Fortunately we had allies to hold the line until we could get partially ready. God forbid that we should have another war, but if we should we might not be so fortunate as to have such allies. Therefore, for the sake of the safety of the country as well as the men themselves, let us not abandon our national defense system at this time.

Now, I want to point out that the main benefits from the reserve and the citizens' military camps are not purely for national defense. Good citizenship is probably the most im-

portant objective and at no time was it so badly needed. I urge my colleagues to defeat the committee and to restore these important items of our national defense.

DEDICATION OF NEW STATE CAPITOL BUILDING, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. OVERTON] at the dedication of the new State Capitol in the city of Baton Rouge, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague Mr. OVERTON in the city of Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, on May 16, 1932:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN H. OVERTON, OF LOUISIANA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW \$5,000,000 STATE CAPITOL

Your Excellency Governor Allen, Mr. Chairman, and fellow citizens, it is indeed, my friends, a pleasure to me, after four months' sojourn in the Capital of the Nation, to find myself once more in the capital of Louisiana. It is a pleasure to stand again upon the soil of my native State and mingle with her splendid and wonderful people. And it is a privilege of which I am justly proud to be permitted to take part in the celebration of a day and an event that promises to be so memorable in the history of our State.

As I stand before this vast throng, composed of citizens assembled here from every section of Louisiana, I am wondering whether they will consider that I am guilty of any impropriety in singling out the people of this splendid city of Baton Rouge and congratulating them upon the fact that the often-agitated question of the removal of our State capital appears about to be definitely settled for all time to come. They deserve our congratulations. There has probably not been in the history of any State in the Union—and, as far as I know, in the history of any nation—a capital that has been so migratory as the capital of Louisiana. Our capital first came into existence in the city of New Orleans, where she remained until 1829. She then journeyed up the Mississippi River and established her residence in the delightful town of Donaldsonville. But in 1831 she concluded to return to the place of her nativity and she reestablished herself in the Crescent City. There she remained until 1846, when, again seized with wanderlust, she once more journeyed up the Mississippi and established her place of abode on the high banks and beautiful site of the city of Baton Rouge.

The dangers of the War between the States caused her to seek a temporary refuge in the town of Opelousas and then in the city of Shreveport. In 1864 she again returned to the metropolis of the South, but in 1882 she concluded to return to the object of her maturer affections. Here she has remained until the present day, but during the 50 years that have intervened since 1882, the date of her last removal, the claim of Baton Rouge to the permanent location of the seat of our Government has been a matter of more or less constant dispute and agitation.

Seven times, therefore, has Louisiana's capital been changed. Legislative statutes and constitutional ordinances have been enacted in vain to compel her to a fixed abode and assign her to a permanent domicile. That vexatious question, however, that has perturbed the State of Louisiana since its admission to the Union has been at last set at rest. It has been settled, Mr. Chairman, not by legislative enactment or constitutional mandate but by the occurrence of two things during the administration that has just been brought to a close. The first was the building in the city of Baton Rouge of a place of residence for our governors becoming the dignity of that high office. The second, and the final and the conclusive event, has been the erection upon this historic site of a permanent, magnificent capitol building, capable of responding to the present needs and the future growth of Louisiana and symbolizing in its architectural beauty, its ample proportions, its massive grandeur, and its towering height of marble, steel, and stone the sovereign majesty of Louisiana's proud Commonwealth.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that we stand upon a historic site. It is not only historical in the sense that it is prophetic of the continued greatness of Louisiana, but it is historical because it teems with memories of the years gone by. On these very grounds, and within a stone's throw of where we are assembled, stood the famous red pole which once marked the boundary lines between the hunting grounds of the Houma and Bayou Goula Indians, and from which Baton Rouge derives its name. Up and down the mighty river that sweeps by us traveled the early explorers of a newly discovered continent. Here the white man pitted himself against the red man, and Spaniards, French, and English contended against each other in their early struggles for the conquest and dominion of a new world. It was upon these grounds that in 1822 the United States Government established a military post by the erection of garrison and arsenal buildings, most of which still stand round about us. Since 1886 up until a short time ago these grounds and buildings have been devoted to the education of Louisiana's youth in that great institution of public education, the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College. Over this site have floated the flags of six different dominions, the flags of France, of Spain, of England, of

the Republic of West Florida, the flag of the Confederacy, and, finally, and let us hope forever, the glorious banner of our Nation, the Stars and Stripes of America.

It is, indeed, my fellow citizens, a far cry from the red pole of the Indian tribes to this stately and towering capitol—

"Whose sky-line dome
Hath typified by work of daring art
The true design and aim"—

of Louisiana and her great people.

It is worthy of observation and comment on this occasion that the few facts of the history of this particular site to which I have referred are, after all, an epitome and panorama of the history and development and evolution of our Nation. The hunting grounds of the Indian; the exploits of the early explorers; the various flags of different nations struggling for the mastery of a new world; the garrisoned post of war; the college and university of public education and enlightenment; and, finally, this massive, modern structure, embodying the conception of a free and independent State, a State that is an integral part of a National Government which, in spite of the gloom and despair and tragedies of the present hour, is still the greatest temporal government ever ordained by "the brain and purpose of man."

In the dedication, Mr. Chairman, of this capitol to its permanent location in this beautiful city, and upon these historic grounds, I wish to take the liberty of congratulating first of all our former governor and present United States Senator, the Hon. HUEY P. LONG. His was the vision to conceive, the courage to propose, and the hand to direct and consummate this great and patriotic enterprise.

I congratulate His Excellency the Hon. O. K. Allen, who has just been honored with the official bestowal of the highest office within the gift of the people of this State, and who has realized an ambition of which any Louisianian may well be proud. And permit me to say, my fellow citizens, that it is indeed a fortunate circumstance that in this trying period we shall have presiding over our new capitol and directing the reigns of our government one possessed of the capacity, the public experience, the indefatigable energy, and the sound common sense of Gov. O. K. Allen.

I extend my congratulations to our lieutenant governor, Hon. John B. Fuornet, to the heads of the various departments of our State, to our senators and representatives, and to the entire official family of the incoming administration upon the fact that they are the first to utilize this capitol wherein largely the future history of Louisiana will be written. I congratulate them that they shall enjoy its advantages and its inspiration in their efforts to complete the great constructive work of the outgoing administration, and in doing their part toward solving the grave problems that now seem to baffle and confuse the legislative councils of almost the entire world.

Above all, I congratulate the people of our State. This is our capitol, authorized by us and owned by us. A capitol is peculiar to and expressive of free and independent states. Monarchies have no capitols. They have the palaces of kings. This great structure is our building, the concrete expression of our pride in our State. There could be, Mr. Chairman, no more convincing and eloquent evidence of the unconquerable spirit and splendid patriotism of the people of Louisiana than the fact that in the midst of the world's greatest depression, they should be here on this day dedicating, not only to their own use but to the use and enjoyment of generations yet to come, a statehouse that would do honor to any State in the Union.

It is indeed a remarkable circumstance, a remarkable tribute to the spirit of the people of this State, that in the midst of this depression Louisiana has not only builded this capitol but has continued a constructive program of public improvement that finds no parallel in any other State of the Union of similar wealth and advantages. And I would be guilty, Mr. Chairman, of misgivings that I do not entertain, I would be guilty of doubting without just cause the capacity and resourcefulness of our newly inaugurated governor, I would be guilty of questioning unfairly the unconquerable spirit of Louisiana, if I did not here prophesy that this great work undertaken by the last administration will yet be completed and brought to a glorious fulfillment under the leadership of the present administration.

I can not, my friends, find it in my heart to sound any note of despair in this festal hour of general rejoicing. Why, anyway, should we of Louisiana surrender to the forces of gloom and despair? We have been through hard times before. We have lived through depressions in the past. We have suffered panics in the years gone by. We have survived them all. We have not only survived them, but we have each time arisen from their conquest stronger in our faith and in our confidence and proceeded to move onward in the pathway of human progress. We have never shown the white feather, and we are not going to show it now. We have in the past met and solved all our problems, and we shall continue to meet and solve them with that determined and victorious spirit with which our pioneer fathers carved a great civilization out of this wilderness and upheld and maintained that civilization and carried it forward to an even more glorious future through all the trials and tribulations of the days of reconstruction.

Why, I repeat, should we surrender to the forces of despair? While it is true that in common with the rest of the Nation we have thousands of our citizens out of employment and our crop prices and commodity prices are at the lowest of levels, yet we still have, undestroyed and unimpaired, our fertile soils, our natural resources, our farms, our cities, our towns, and our structures and institutions of public welfare. No plague or pestilence,

no war within the last few years, has destroyed or depleted the agricultural, industrial, laboring, or economic forces of this State or Nation. We have as much natural and tangible wealth as we had in the 1929 peak year of prosperity.

It must, therefore, be apparent to anyone that our present financial difficulty is not to be attributed to a loss or depletion of wealth or of our resources or of our man power. We have all these in the same abundance that we had in the very height and zenith of our prosperity. The main trouble, my friends, lies in both the hoarding and the unequal distribution of the wealth of this country.

Is there any man, rich or poor, billionaire or pauper, who will defend the proposition that it is either sound or just for 1 per cent of the people of this country to own and control 59 per cent of its wealth? We are still the richest, as we are the most powerful and the greatest Nation on the face of the globe and in all the history of the world. We still have an estimated national wealth of \$400,000,000,000. But, in all frankness, let me ask the question whether it is sound economically, whether it is conducive to the general welfare, whether it is helpful to the happiness and liberty and progress of our people, that 1 per cent of our population of 120,000,000 souls should own and control over two hundred billions of our national wealth and the rest of it be parceled out among the remaining 99 per cent? There is nothing socialistic or radical in such an attitude toward public affairs. I am conservative by nature. I simply put the plain and unvarnished statement of the present concentration and reconcentration of wealth in the hands of the few, and I challenge even the beneficiaries of such an economic condition successfully to defend it.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

I take no stand, my fellow citizens, against wealth as such or against its honest accumulation. I do not advocate its confiscation; but I do adhere to the sound and just doctrine that the taxes and the expenses of government should fall on those best able to bear them, and I do urge that, especially in this hour of national calamity, wealth should be made to bear an increasing proportion of our public burdens.

The President of the United States, its Secretary of the Treasury, our greatest political leaders, our financial experts, and economists tell us that we are face to face with one of the greatest crises in the history of our country. They tell us that we are at war—at war against depression, at war against financial collapse, at war against the threatened bankruptcy of our Governments, National and State. How, then, are we to fight against the forces of economic collapse and financial bankruptcy? What are the means, the munitions, the instrumentalities of this kind of warfare? When we are engaged in physical warfare, when the enemy fires upon the American flag, what do we do? We summon—we have always summoned—the masses and manhood of this country to rally to its battle standards, and they have always responded to our call to arms.

In the late World War we not only summoned but we drafted and conscripted them. We took the clerk from behind his counter, the laborer from out of his factory, the farmer's boy from behind his plow. We placed them in training camps; we sent them 3,000 miles across the ocean; we offered them as living sacrifices to the murderous fire of the enemy's guns in order that our Nation might be saved from the great danger that threatened it and this world made safe for true democracy. And they—the farmer's boy, the clerk, the laborer, the fighting manhood of our Nation—brought Old Glory back from across the seas unsullied and undefeated. And in every physical warfare in which we have been engaged—from the Revolutionary War to the World War, from Lexington and Concord to Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry—the great masses of our American citizenship, its men and women, have so rallied to the flag that it never yet has been lowered in defeat.

But, my friends, we are engaged to-day in no physical conflict. The war in which we are engaged is a financial and economic one, and in such a conflict we can look only to the wealth of our country to supply the resources, the forces, the munitions, and the weapons of battle. And in this hour of national financial peril, in this hour of threatened governmental bankruptcy, it is proper that the wealth of our country should be compelled to its defense by adequate taxation upon its incomes and its inheritances for the purpose of national salvation.

Let us therefore, Mr. Chairman and my fellow citizens of Louisiana, dedicate this capitol and rededicate ourselves to the simple and imperishable truths upon which our Republic was founded in a period of greater storm and stress than now confronts us. It is the observance of, and adherence to, these fundamental maxims of public policy that will preserve our Nation and its glorious sisterhood of States from the perils that threaten their destruction. Let us dedicate this capitol to "the self-evident truths that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." And let us dedicate this capitol to the sublime truth that from the beginning it was ordained to be, and through the patriotic purpose of a mighty people and under the blessings of a Divine Providence it will continue to be, "a government of the people, by the people, for the people."

LAWLESSNESS

Mr. KARCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARCH. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress can not afford to adjourn without passing legislation which will remedy the two cardinal evils that notoriously exist and are threatening the life of this country. One is the unemployment situation, and the other is the crime wave. The two problems are, in my judgment, of equal gravity. In fact, I believe that they are interrelated.

However, I am addressing myself at this time particularly to the intolerable condition of lawlessness which is rampant throughout the country and has virtually broken down all law and order. If we are candid with ourselves, we have to confess that the ordinary law-enforcing machinery of the Nation has broken completely down.

The very first function of Government is to protect the life of its citizens. At this hour any man's life is in danger; the same is true of his property. I am sure I am within the record when I say that murders in this country have increased one hundred fold within the last decade, and that kidnaping has increased at a much larger ratio. The traditional judicial and police law enforcement instrumentalities, as they are provided by the several States, are not only inadequate but wholly incompetent to cope with the exigency.

I have given this question serious study for many years. I have observed this growing menace to our society very closely. But it really requires no specialization to appreciate the seriousness of this national disaster. Dire apprehension is in the mind of every good citizen as to where it will finally end.

The Wickersham Commission commented upon the gravity and magnitude of crime and general lawlessness, and I understand they are about to further report astounding revelations in this connection in the near future.

The States, as I have indicated, are impotent to suppress the crime movement at its present stage. It has been my observation that in the commission of the major crimes, such as murder, kidnaping, bombing, rape, and such criminal activities as are perpetrated in the furtherance of what is known as "racketeering," only one out of a hundred is ever successfully prosecuted.

I further make the assertion that there are many thousands of such crimes enacted which never become publicly known. Frequently, we hear of persons mysteriously disappearing. Hundreds of our women are being raped, who, either out of modesty or fear of naming the guilty parties, forego reporting their experiences.

In a large percentage of cases in which prosecutions are attempted, witnesses will either not appear at all or testify in exoneration of the accused under the duress which is actually or presumably held over them by the gang of which the defendant happens to be affiliated.

As I have said before in an address in the House of Representatives, crime is not sporadic and emanating from individuals here and there. Crime is organized. Crime is entrenched in fortified camps. Killers and homicidal maniacs constitute a veritable hostile army in our midsts. Brains and master minds are the captains in this army, while the morons and perverts, dope fiends, and other human débris, either serve under these captains or fraternize with their cause.

These captains command millions of dollars which we know they employ, first, to corrupt officials and, secondly, to defend themselves against prosecutions.

The time is here to-day and at this very hour that the Federal Government must assume the burden of eradicating criminal lawlessness. I am fully aware of the doctrine that the police power resides only in the States, and in ordinary times that is where it ought to be.

But these are extraordinary times. This is war, war between human rights and the forces of good government on

the one side, and the boast of corruption, lawlessness, bribery, murder, arson, rapine, abduction, robbery on the other.

This Government can not endure if its citizens are constantly in a potential danger of being assassinated and abducted, its women in danger of being ravished, and its babies kidnaped and brutally murdered.

In order to make it definite and certain that the Federal Government has clear and incontestable jurisdiction to surveil the activities of these modern brigands, bandits, and freebooters in their arrogant and ruthless spoliation of the lives and the property of the citizens, I am proposing by the joint resolution that I have introduced in the House to-day to amend the Constitution of the United States—conferring upon Congress plenary and unlimited authority to create a code of laws and to set up a crime-surveilling machinery that will be effective and adequate in the premises.

This joint resolution, which will probably be known as the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, could, and, in my judgment, would, pass both Houses of Congress before the end of the present session, and inasmuch as the necessary number of States will hold legislative sessions in January, 1933, it is very probable, under the state of the public mind as it now exists, that the amendment would be ratified by these States, thereby enabling Congress to exercise its new powers within less than one year from this day.

I regret that the President of the United States and the Attorney General have not heretofore moved in the premises. I can not conceive how they can sit supinely by and permit this national menace to continue.

If the Attorney General has been correctly quoted, he went out of his way to advise the Judiciary Committee of the House that the Government is not disposed to take on any additional obligations in that behalf or to enter into new fields of criminal jurisdiction, and that he specifically opposed the various bills before the Judiciary Committee of the House, including the Cochran bill, which undertakes to penalize kidnaping transactions involving interstate transportation of the victims.

But in contradiction to their attitude and by sheer usurpation of power these exalted officials have tendered the entire law-enforcing agency of the Federal Government to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in his quest to seek and apprehend the guilty parties who abducted and murdered his little baby. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing that action; on the contrary, it is what they ought to do and what they should have done immediately.

The Lindbergh case illustrates forcibly the utter inefficacy of the State police methods and systems. As the Wickersham Commission has well said, the law officers of the States are woefully incompetent. Sheriffs and policemen are not chosen for their technique but invariably for political reasons. Police duty in this day and age requires experts—men of a very high order of intelligence, courage, and integrity. These modern crimes can only be solved by scientific men and scientific methods. The days of the Hawkshaws and constables are over.

Bone-headed police, from Norman Schwartzkopf down, have bungled the Lindbergh case and have even hampered, if not frustrated, the potential possibilities of apprehending the guilty parties. If the agencies of the Federal Government had taken full charge of this case in its early stages, assuming that it would have had on its staff expert criminologists and investigators, I believe that the baby's life would have been spared, and the guilty perpetrators of this dastardly crime, which has shocked the world, would have been apprehended and summarily and successfully prosecuted. Certainly the Curtis-Peacock hoax, unequaled in its mendacity, would not have been permitted to be perpetrated upon the credulous and broken-hearted Lindbergh and to further aggravate his wounded sensibilities.

But would Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mitchell do for other fathers and mothers of less distinction than the Lindberghs what they did for them? Since the Lindbergh kidnaping there have been a score or more of kidnapings of children

and adults equally precious and dear to their kin, but not a word or the turn of a hand by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mitchell.

I warn that the kidnaping epidemic has only started. In the future victims in the common walks of life—yes; hundreds of them—will be marked for exploitation. I recall reading recently of several instances in which children of parents of moderate means were kidnaped and held for ransom in sums ranging from \$300 to \$5,000. From whom can this class of victims expect protection and assistance?

I propose by my measure to do for all of the mothers and fathers and for all of the babies in this country who may hereafter become victimized by kidnapers what Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mitchell have so freely and generously undertaken to do for Mr. and Mrs. Lindbergh.

We are told that the liquor traffic before prohibition caused the deaths, within the United States, of approximately 2,000 persons annually. Crime in recent years has claimed many thousands of lives annually. If there was justification for the eighteenth amendment, which I deny, there is more justification for a constitutional amendment to extirpate crime which not only slays thousands of human beings and deprives citizens of their property but, unless arrested, will convert this country of boasted law and order into anarchy and chaos.

The Cochran bill should be immediately passed by Congress. It is as drastic and far-reaching as possible under our present constitutional limitations. However, I can conceive of kidnaping transactions that could not be reached by the terms of that measure. The kidnapers could evade the provisions of any Federal law now capable of being enacted by so scheming as to avoid the use of the mail and interstate movements. Furthermore, the inadequacy of such legislation is obvious because Federal agencies could not intervene until postcrime facts develop which indicate the use of the mail or the interstate transportation of the victim.

SOLDIERS' ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing in the RECORD a statement I made before the Committee on Ways and Means recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following argument made by myself before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, April 15, 1932:

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I promised several Members time this morning, and I just have to do the very best I can under the circumstances. I will have to go out of order again. Mr. Jed Johnson is on the Military Affairs Committee and they are going to consider a very important matter this morning. They are in session at this time. He has introduced H. R. 10096 asking for the full payment of the adjusted-service certificates. He only wants a few minutes of your time.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. We shall be glad to hear him.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, because of my desire to speed up the hearings, and also because several of my distinguished colleagues desire to appear before your distinguished committee, I shall not take as much time as I had contemplated using.

I have attended practically all of the hearings and have also listened on the floor of the House to arguments made against this bill since these hearings began. I have also read a great many editorials in newspapers arguing against the passage of this bonus legislation, and I find that the great burden of the argument against the payment of the veterans' adjusted certificates in full seems to be, first, that this is not a debt due the veterans but a gift, and outright dole, or donation that Congress is called upon to make. Some say that if it is a debt that the debt is not now due. We are constantly reminded that the adjusted-service certificates will not become due under the law until 1945.

I do not share the views of the opposition who say that this is not a debt; neither do I admit for a moment that it is not due.

I listened with surprise to one of the witnesses for the bonus the other day who said, "We admit that it is not due." I make no such admission. I do not hesitate to say to this committee that it is all past due, and it is a rank insult to every man who wore the uniform to refer to this legislation as a proposed donation to the World War veterans.

All of you will doubtless remember that hardly had the bark of the cannon died away and the smoke cleared up from the battlefields in the Argonne Forest when the railroads, the shipbuilders, and some of the ammunition factories, as well as several thousand civilian employees, came to Congress demanding a bonus for their "patriotic war-time services." They did not ask for promissory notes. The railroads did not ask for notes due in 1945. The shipbuilders did not ask for promises, but they wanted the cash on the barrel head. I am ashamed to say that Congress very soon after the war gave the shipbuilders their bonus, and gave it to them in cold cash. They gave the civilian employees, the shipbuilders, the railroads, and the ammunition makers, some of whom had profiteered to the tune of 500 per cent, their bonus in cash. Then, after the railroads had gotten their bonus, some one thought that probably the boys who had faced the machine guns at a dollar and a quarter a day should have their pay adjusted—not a bonus, mind you; Congress never gave the veterans a bonus, but merely proposed to adjust their pay.

Then others have said that the veterans are now breaking faith with Congress; that they had agreed to take these promissory notes, this sort of long-time insurance, and therefore that the veterans had broken faith with Congress. I want to remind the members of this committee that no outstanding veteran or veterans' organization, like the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, or disabled veteran organizations, ever asked for this thing they got. But they had to accept the 20-year adjusted-service certificates or nothing.

In the fall of 1919 the first American Legion convention was held in Minneapolis. At that convention a resolution was adopted calling attention of the Congress in a general way to the fact that "our Government has an obligation to all service men and women to relieve the financial disadvantages incident to their military service, an obligation second only to that of caring for the disabled and the widows and orphans of those who sacrificed their lives, and one already acknowledged by our allies."

In February, 1920, Congress having failed to give any relief in the matter of adjusting the pay of our former service men, the American Legion executive committee met in Indianapolis and passed a resolution again calling the attention of the Congress that in the opinion of the Legion all service men and women were entitled to adjusted compensation "in the form and for the amount of a \$50 bond for each month's service rendered during the period of this war."

Congress failed and refused to pass the legislation requested by any service men's organization or any outstanding veteran, but Members of this body contented themselves, up until 1924, by delivering many speeches in both Houses, eulogizing the boys for their heroism rather than giving them substantial relief. Toward the latter part of 1920 the American Legion presented what was termed its fourfold plan and the same was introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee where this committee added what it called a 20-year paid-up insurance to the veteran. I call your attention to the fact that the fifth plan of insurance instead of cash was not the brainchild of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the disabled veterans, or any other former service men's organization, but it had its inception in this powerful committee as a sort of sop to the soldiers and yet permitted the Government to escape and evade the payment of the adjusted pay in cash, as the veterans and veterans' organizations were at that time demanding.

The plan to adjust the pay of the veterans, in cash, was bitterly opposed and defeated by the international bankers, bond brokers, and Wall Street in general. In fact, many of the same gentlemen who will appear before this committee in the next few days in opposition to legislation to pay the bonus in full now, stated the same, or similar, reasons for opposing any kind of a bonus bill ten or a dozen years ago. It is not worth while for me to go further into the history of this legislation. Some of the distinguished members of this committee recall how a multimillionaire Secretary of the Treasury appeared before this committee time and again between the years 1920 and 1924 in opposition to any kind of a soldier bonus bill and especially in opposition to the bill veterans were sponsoring to adjust their pay in cash. When the bill was finally passed to hand the veterans a promissory note instead of adjusting their pay Wall Street and the other international bankers and bond brokers with foreign securities openly boasted that they had won a great victory.

I said a while ago that the railroads, munition makers, shipbuilders, civilian employees, and others received their adjusted pay in the year 1919, immediately after the ending of the war. They not only received their pay but they also received the interest rate they demanded from the beginning of the war. I submit in all fairness that if those with less-hazardous jobs were entitled to pay from the beginning of the war, with interest, the war veterans, who faced machine guns and the shrapnel that American profiteers sold to this Government at 500 per cent profit, are entitled to interest from the date of their enlistment. If that be true and the war veteran had been paid his interest at the same rate the railroads received at the hands of this Government, the adjusted-service certificates would have fallen due in the year 1931. I have no apologies in looking members of this committee in the face and say it is a just debt; it is an acknowledged obligation by the Government; it is long past due, and this Congress can not longer sidestep nor evade the issue.

So, I repeat, that if the veterans had received their interest at the same rate that the railroads, the shipbuilders, and the civilian

employees and others who profited off war received theirs, every penny of it would be due now.

Mr. RAINEX. May I interrupt?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. You may ask me a question.

Mr. RAINEX. What do you mean by bonus to the railroads?

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean that they asked and received their bonus in cold cash with added interests from the very moment they were taken over.

Mr. RAINEX. Was that not a payment for the Government operation of the railroads during the war?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes; Congress called it a payment. I say that in fact it was a gift—in cold cash. Congress proved itself to be a big Santa Claus to the railroads.

Mr. RAINEX. That was a reimbursement to the stockholders of the railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON. Reimbursement is the term Congress applied, but may I remind the distinguished gentlemen that considering the watered stock, it proved to be a donation or a dole rather than a bona fide reimbursement.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I will yield, although I must not consume too much time.

Mr. VINSON. I just want to make the observation that in turning the railroads back to private ownership they certainly got section 15 (a) of the interstate commerce act, which carried the recapture clause.

Mr. JOHNSON. Absolutely. The railroads ought to believe in Santa Claus.

Mr. VINSON. And if I read the signs of the times, there is going to be several hundred million dollars turned back to them by virtue of legislation which will probably be enacted at this Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; by legislation already enacted. Congress was induced to pass the \$2,000,000,000 Reconstruction Finance Corporation act in order, we were told, to end the depression, and Congress dished out another dole to the railroads. Now all of us realize that it was a farce and a fake. We now have the sorry spectacle of seeing defunct railroads "borrowing" millions of dollars from the Government with their bonds worth 12 cents on the dollar.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand it, the amount involved under this recapture clause is something like \$500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think that is about right. I am sure the distinguished gentleman knows.

Mr. HILL. That is money that the railroads have earned.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; but earned under the mandate of section 15 (a), which provided that the Interstate Commerce Commission should fix the rates at such a figure that they would earn the 5½ per cent plus the 1 per cent for rehabilitation, and one-half of the 1 per cent for rehabilitation was under the recapture clause to go in the Treasury of the United States, and very few dollars have yet found their way into the Treasury of the United States, and the \$500,000,000 or more will be turned back to the railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman's statement is unquestionably true, and in that connection, since the question of the railroads earning their bonus has been raised, I want to say, not as a general who pulled down a big salary during the war, but as a very humble private in the rear ranks but with front-line service, that I know war veterans more than earned every dollar Congress has admitted it owes them.

The opposition to this legislation has greatly stressed the fact that the American Legion organization in its last national convention failed to pass a resolution indorsing the bonus. Also, that Commander Stevens, of that great organization, has recently gone on record as violently opposed to it.

I do not care to go into that discussion further than to say that neither the action of the national convention nor that of the wealthy young commander who doesn't need his bonus certificate represents the sentiment of the rank and file of the legionnaires of Oklahoma. For the national commander to say that only 23 posts of the country had indorsed the bonus at the time of his statement was absurd on the face of it. Practically every American Legion post in the State of Oklahoma indorsed full payment months ago. What applies to Oklahoma applies in a general way to a majority of the States of the Union. I am told that national committeemen of that great organization will soon meet at Indianapolis and at that time will give Commander Stevens some inside information and probably a just reprimand for his unwarranted action in opposing this just legislation.

When the array of big business men, great financiers, near financiers, economists, and would-be economists appear before this committee next week in opposition to this legislation, I assume that the burden of their arguments will be that this bill, if and when passed, will destroy the financial structure of the Government. No doubt the committee will be warned against the passage of this legislation and will be repeatedly told that the 50 per cent loans made to the veterans by the last Congress did not revive business.

Let me say in reply to the charge that the 50 per cent loans did not stimulate business. I personally know that in many sections the veterans' loan not only revived but was a tremendous stimulation to business in general in spite of the fact that not one dollar of actual money was issued. What the veterans received was credit, not money. Not one new dollar was placed in circulation, and that, gentlemen, was not a gift. What Congress actually did was to lend the veteran 50 per cent of his own money. It must also be remembered that a great majority of the veterans who have borrowed at all on their certificates had previously borrowed

20 to 25 per cent before the passage of the 50 per cent act. So the loans in fact only amounted to 25 to 30 per cent instead of 50 per cent, as one unfamiliar with this legislation might think. The inference has also gone out that the veterans' loans have caused the deficit in the Treasury; that the money came from the pockets of the taxpayers of the country.

Even Members of Congress have made such erroneous statements. The fact is that aside from a small amount appropriated by Congress to administer the fund, this money, or practically all of it, came from the veterans themselves; from premiums paid by the veterans on their insurance during their war-time service. That fund, made up of premiums on this insurance, amounted to \$881,000,000, and yet Congressmen and others boast that they gave the veterans the money. What Congress did was to lend 50 per cent on these certificates, and then had the nerve to charge the veteran $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent compound interest on his own money. At the same time this Government can go out in the market and get money for less than 2 per cent. The veterans know they did not get a square deal on that loan, and it is a sad fact unless the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent compound interest is canceled many veterans will actually owe the Government on the last half of the bonus in 1945.

Answering the charge that payment of the bonus in full will hurt business, I will say to this committee that I do not pose as an economist or a financier. If the great Champ Clark, after studying the money question for a lifetime, would admit that he knew nothing about the money question and doubted seriously if anybody else did, I would not have the temerity to tell this committee that I pose as an authority on the subject. If I thought that the payment of the last half of the bonus would impair the financial structure of the Government or hurt business to any extent whatsoever, I would not, under any circumstances, support this legislation. On the other hand, after talking to many economists and financiers in high authority, I am fully convinced that the currency must be expanded or reexpanded, as Senator Owen and other authorities on the subject have said, and it occurs to me that either the Patman bill or the Thomas-Johnson bill (H. R. 10096), introduced by me and now pending before this committee, would be a practical way of expanding the currency. In my judgment it is imperative that some action be taken by Congress and that immediately, to give the country cheaper money.

I think it is generally admitted that money has become entirely too high and commodities too unreasonably low, and something must be done and done quickly to bring up the price of commodities and cheapen the dollar. The fact that members of the Federal Reserve Board all over the United States, after these hearings started, were called to Washington to discuss ways and means to expand the currency is evidence that there is merit to this legislation.

Of course, all of us understand that this hurried action on the part of the Federal Reserve Board at this time is primarily for the purpose of defeating this legislation, but even if that be true the veterans have won a moral victory and yet the average American citizen will ask himself if the Federal Reserve Board can, without any authority of law, go into the open markets and buy a billion dollars' worth of securities why did it not do so six months ago—why did it not do so a year ago—or two years ago—and save the country from the most terrible money panic America has had in the past quarter of a century? The announcement of the Federal Reserve Board that it will increase the currency within the next few weeks is a terrible condemnation of its policies in its failure and refusal to do so in the past.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, you do not think that the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board completely supports the theory of the opponents of this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is quite true. On the other hand it demonstrates that the Federal Reserve Board admits the soundness of the plans here being considered. It is not a question of what Congress would like to do, but I am fully convinced that the expansion or reexpansion of the currency must be done, and that it must be done quickly.

Mr. RAGON. If I understood Senator THOMAS when he was here the other day, he felt that the terms of the Patman bill might greatly injure the Federal reserve system.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I heard the statement of our distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I do not share his view altogether. There is no question but that some of the money under the Patman bill would come in competition with the Federal reserve, but it would not be any appreciable amount, and not enough to kill the Federal reserve or seriously cripple it. But frankly, I measure my words when I say the Federal Reserve Board ought to function as originally intended in the interest of the people, or else Congress ought to abolish it.

I desire to make it plain, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that I am not wedded to any plan. I have no pride of authorship of the bill I have introduced in Congress in keeping with the ideas suggested by Senator THOMAS and also similar to the suggestion of Senator OWEN. The Thomas-Johnson bill would go through the Federal reserve and make that a functioning organization operating in the interest of the people instead of by and for Wall Street and the international bankers.

It is needless for me to picture to you the conditions and the need for relief for our war veterans and their families. You have heard that over and over again; but let me say in closing that if \$2,000,000,000 of additional currency were sent out into every

nook and corner of America, in my judgment it would revive business immediately. It is a practical way of increasing or expanding the currency. It would have the effect of raising commodity prices. It would save the homes of thousands of war veterans where foreclosures have already been started. It would melt the long bread lines, stop suicides, and relieve suffering in every town and hamlet. It would not only fill empty box cars but fill millions of empty stomachs, and replace misery and suffering with a ray of sunshine and hope, and at the same time pay a just and acknowledged debt due the war veterans by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CRISP. We thank you very much for your presence.

CRITICISMS OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, more untrue, unfair, mean things are being said about Members of Congress than ever before. We are only human and make mistakes just like other folks. We should be criticized like other folks. The criticisms should be fair, honest, and based on a true statement of facts. There is not an honest Member of Congress who would not welcome criticisms, to the fullest extent, of his official record in Congress and yet in political campaigns and generally this is not done. Exactly the contrary too often takes place.

Speaking for myself—most other Members feel the same way—I beg and plead for honest criticisms of the thousands of votes I have cast; the hundreds of speeches and statements I have made; the scores of bills I have introduced and the hundreds and even thousands of official acts I have performed.

If anyone feels that by word or act I have ever been unfair to the farmer, the laboring man, the ex-soldier, or the common people, please let him say where, when, and how. I know some feel that I should be criticized. Many see things differently from me. To these I say, "Criticize my record, my votes, my bills, my speeches, my official conduct, and what I did or did not do. Please do not blame me for what others do over my protest. Please do not arrest me, try me, convict me, hang me, and blacken the name of myself and family forever for crimes of which I am absolutely innocent, which I condemn, and which I did my very best to prevent at the very risk of my political existence."

No fair man would condemn all the members of all the churches for the sins of only a few, neither would he condemn all humanity for the crimes of an individual.

An honest man would not visit punishment on the whole of a family for the errors of a brother or sister, and yet every day, in almost every newspaper and in every political statement we see or hear, we find an avalanche of awful criticisms and vile abuses heaped on all of Congress and every Member thereof, all because some one believes that either a majority of Congress or a minority of Congress or an individual Member has made a mistake or done wrong.

I beg the public to judge each tree by its own fruit and each vine by its own thorns. Sodom and Gomorrah were not destroyed because there were a few or even a majority of the inhabitants sinful, but because all violated and transgressed God's law. Everyone was judged by his own deeds, and the punishment was altogether just.

At this time I want to limit this discussion to some newspaper criticisms, and especially to a criticism of a bill introduced by me some time ago. I do not object to a criticism of my bill. I do object, though, to a distorted, unfair criticism; and it is of this I wish to speak presently. Before I do this let us endeavor to ascertain why more criticisms are being made of Congressmen than ever before. Is it because they are worse? I do not think so. Is it because we are putting forth less effort than previously? Surely this is not the case. There is a greater effort to render real service than was ever known before. What is the trouble, then? I know the cause, and I will put the blame where I feel it belongs; but before doing so I want to excuse many of the local or county papers for carrying this unfair propaganda. As a rule these small papers are edited by the very best men in our country. They would not purposely do

any man, woman, or child an injustice. It happens oftentimes, though, that being misled by the big dailies or other large periodicals they innocently reprint items that are unfair, misleading, and that do an injustice.

Thus it is that no one can estimate the injustice that may be done by one unfair article carried by a big paper, reproduced by smaller papers, and then carried by word of mouth throughout the length and breadth of the country.

No one knows the never-ending, powerful, deadly effect of such poison better than the big financial interests and their paid allies—the big subsidized newspapers of the Nation.

Just as the rattlesnake uses his poison to destroy those he does not like, so the great financial interests and great newspapers owned or controlled by them use the venom of misrepresentation in an effort to kill those who oppose them or do not humbly do their will.

These big papers mislead the public by failing and refusing to publish the truth concerning Members of Congress who are not subservient to the big interests and who refuse to do the will of the big papers and their owners. They perpetrate a fraud on the public and seek to destroy faithful Members of Congress by not publishing anything that is to the credit of the Member without twisting and distorting it and by leaving out the most important part so as to make the Member appear silly or criminal, or both, and his official act appear vicious and antagonistic to his people.

These papers also seize upon slight indiscretions of a few Members to bring reproach upon all the Congress. They take special care by separate special personal items to make those who truckle to them appear to be patriotic statesmen and worthy of the fullest confidence of all people. Small or trivial matters are unduly magnified, distorted, and twisted beyond all reason.

This is what is done as to the Members' stationery allowance, mileage, franking privilege, and clerical assistance.

Every presidential-campaign year the country is whipped into a frenzy of hatred of Members of Congress by grossly unfair representations as to these items. I wish there was some way for them all to be eliminated. I will vote to cut out entirely the stationery allowance and the mileage.

The stationery allowance was \$125 a year, and this session I voted to make it \$90 a year. I would much rather pay out of my salary the cost of my ink, pens, envelopes, letterheads, and other stationery than have the newspapers always abusing my friends and me about this item.

Let us discuss briefly the mileage item of 20 cents a mile each way to cover all traveling expenses for each year unless there is an extra session. The public has been led to believe that every time a Member rides on the train he either rides on a pass or at 3 cents a mile and charges 20 cents a mile up to the Government. This is not the case, and yet our people, by this false statement, are led to hate us and feel that we are very dishonest.

Some say the actual traveling expenses of Members should be paid instead of this straight allowance. This would cost the Government much more. Many Members go home every week, some every night, and practically every Member spends his entire mileage allowance each year traveling to and from his home or on board and other expenses staying in Washington on the job, while others are going to and from their homes.

If actual traveling expenses were paid, the man who stayed on this job the least and ran over the country the most would get the most money, and the man who stayed on the job the most would get the least.

The man who lives a long distance away and makes only one trip a year may save a little money, but even this is spent in paying expenses here, and for his family if he has one.

There is no traveling allowance for a Member's family.

Since criticism of this mileage item has been made in my district and was evidently intended for me, I trust I will be pardoned for a personal reference when I say that no one in Congress has a better record for staying on the job

than I have. I have never been out of Washington a single day while the House was in session since I was elected. I have never gone to Georgia or elsewhere while the House was in session except to the funeral of a Georgia Member of the House or a Georgia Senator, and I stay here doing urgent departmental work most of the time the House is not in session. And yet, in spite of the small amount of traveling I do, I have not been able to save any money out of my travel allowance.

I voted to cut it to 15 cents a mile each year, and I will vote to cut it out altogether. If the Senate passes the bill we passed in the House, my mileage for the present whole calendar year would be about \$250. I would rather not get this than to be called a leech, a thief, and a crook because of this allowance.

It will cost almost as much as I get out of my mileage allowance to pay for the printing and mailing out of one ordinary set of speeches in which I attempt to defend Congress and myself against these unwarranted assaults. I will send out one set of speeches this summer that will cost me in actual cash more than twice as much as this mileage allowance.

My railroad ticket alone for my wife and two children and myself to visit Georgia the last of this month will cost me in cash more than twice my mileage for this year, and I will not get the allowance paid during this year until next December.

I wish there was no mileage allowance so that there would be no such opportunity for anyone to apply the name of thief, leech, crook, and so forth, and so on, to Members of Congress and United States Senators, both now living and who in the past have served so well and honorably and now have gone on to the Great Beyond.

The members of the Georgia Legislature get 10 cents a mile traveling expenses for only a few days' service. Considering the length of time they serve and the length of time Members of Congress actually serve each year, the members of the Georgia house and senate get five or more times as much mileage allowance per mile as Members of Congress.

I certainly do not criticize these good men of my State or any other State where mileage is allowed.

I am just wondering how anyone who has served in the Georgia Legislature or has friends or brothers who have served there can find it in his heart to bitterly criticize those, both living and dead, who serve and have served in Congress and who have been allowed much less pay per mile than were allowed our good friends present and past who served honorably and well in our State general assembly.

Another allowance that has been severely criticized is that of clerical assistance. I do not have a relative on my clerical force, but am honest when I say that I can see no valid objections to a relative doing this work, provided always genuine service is rendered for the salary.

The work in a Congressman's office in many instances is of the most confidential nature. Nothing can be more confidential than the medical record or other personal record of veterans and others who every day apply to Congressmen for help.

Again there is no place on earth where loyalty counts for more than in a Congressman's office. The secretary with the greatest loyalty always renders the greatest possible service to the people whom the Member represents. What our people want is service. It is infinitely better for a Member to have his wife or brother in his office rendering real, honest-to-goodness service rather than disloyal clerks who are not giving value received, and instead of helping the Member and his people are either purposely or negligently doing harm to all concerned.

No one would criticize a father for bringing his son along to help do a plumbing job or to help split rails on the farm.

No one would criticize an editor because his wife and child helped him set the type, unless it was for letting them do too much work.

Why should not that editor if elected to Congress employ his relative to help him make a success in his office work,

provided that relative renders real service for the pay and more nearly gives value received for the money than anyone else?

I do not hear any criticism of the lawyer whose daughter is his stenographer or of the judge who helps his son get a job or helps his son get into a good partnership and thus get good cases and a good practice or who as judge tries his son's cases.

Why should a lawyer or judge if elected to Congress not use the very best available clerical help, regardless of whether that help is related to him or not?

Of course, it is wrong if any money is paid to anyone who does not give value received in return. This is true regardless of whether the party is a relative or merely a political helper or other person who does not render value received.

It is not at all necessary for a clerk to earn his or her full salary by his or her own actual work any more than a contractor earns the full contract price of constructing a building by his own labor alone.

He must earn the contract price by his own labor, and the labor of those he employs and the cost of material he must put in the building under his contract.

I understand many Members give their clerks all the allowance and then let the clerk pay for all other clerical help which the clerks can not handle personally, such as multi-graphing and scores of items too numerous to mention.

Each Member has his own idea about his office work. Some want a clerk or clerks who will undertake to relieve the Member of every responsibility except that of a legislative nature. Some require much more stenographic work than others. In other words, every Member has his own idea as to how he wants his office work handled. Some few Members do not use the full amount allowed for clerical help and leave the balance in the Treasury. Many are wealthy and can pay their clerks out of their own money if they think it is a good political move.

It has been generally reported that some of the wealthier Members let their clerks have the full clerical allowance and also the Member's full salary. Of course they are making their millions in other ways than as a salary.

But those of us who are poor men should use this allowance in the way to get the best results for the people whom we represent. When the entire allowance is paid to one or two persons with them to pay for all additional clerical help which the Member may request, controversy may easily arise, and I understand does arise, as to how much money the clerk or clerks should pay out for this additional help.

So far as I am concerned, I find the best way is to agree just what each clerk shall do and then pay him that full amount and let him keep the full amount agreed upon.

It is much better for all concerned that each clerk know exactly what he is to receive and keep, exactly what he is to do, and that the Member know what amount he can spend for additional clerical help before he begins to spend his own salary for this line of work. I can properly and profitably use for my people much more clerical allowance than I get, and yet recently I voted to cut this pay and am sure this cut will pass.

I wish I had sufficient clerical allowance to hire some legal help in each county to help veterans and others get their claims in proper shape. I would like to pay for some newspaper space in all my local papers so that from time to time I could give valuable information to the public—not of a political nature—as to rights of the farmers, the veterans, and public generally. I wish I had enough money to experiment in the sale of some farm products of my section directly from producer to consumer. I could very easily use here in Washington the services of a good young lawyer all the time to handle matters of a legal nature which pass through my office.

The allowance is not sufficient for these purposes. As it is, I work from 12 to 14 and 15 hours a day, personally handle all the legal and complicated matters, do much of my own clerical work, use a typewriter when necessary, and endeavor to give the very best possible clerical and office help to my people.

After all, it is a matter of service. If the party who is on the pay roll is rendering value received to the public, all is well and good; but if the party is not earning his salary, the public is mistreated, regardless of whether the clerk is a relative of the Congressman or the relative of some political boss or the relative of some one who got the job for him by a political pull.

For my part, I may say, for many hours each day I personally do the secretarial work of my office without any stenographer or clerk. Most of the day I have two clerks in the office. Then, again, I need the help of a half dozen or more clerks or assistants. When Congress is not in session I generally keep my Washington office open with two clerks and hire additional help down home.

I am sure most Members get the best possible service for their districts from this very necessary allowance; and if some errors of judgment are made by a few, the entire membership should not be condemned.

The all-consuming question is whether or not the Member is heart and soul for his people and is he day and night and all the time in every way possible doing his very best for his people? Is he and his clerical force loyal to his people and his Nation and not a traitor to those he represents and for whom they should labor?

In these remarks I shall not attempt to answer all the numerous unfair, misrepresentations that are viciously hurled at Members of Congress by those who are unable to dominate all legislation. This would necessitate the writing of a book.

The great financial interests which dominate the big newspapers are more guilty than anyone else of the awful offense of precipitating the greatest financial depression and the most human suffering in the history of the world. These very people are doing everything possible to direct the attention of the public away from their awful record of guilt. This is actuated by the criminal design to protect themselves at the expense of others, and to force Congress into passing many vicious laws unfair to the public and in furtherance of the awful orgy of plunder and robbery by these malefactors of all humanity.

During the World War and since, the rich became immensely rich and there sprang up many, many more millionaires and multimillionaires than ever before. This all happened in spite of the appalling loss of life and property as the result of the war. All this can only mean the common average citizen not only suffered all the loss of life and property destroyed during the war but even what property he had left was, in most instances, simply stolen from him by the crowd that did not fight but who profiteered, plundered, and robbed while their countrymen were fighting and dying.

There were already many laws under which the rich could plunder the poor; many more have since been enacted. The wealth of the world has practically been taken from the poorer class and either destroyed or delivered into the hands of the very rich, who are hoarding it and letting the common people suffer and die in the greatest depression the world ever experienced.

Let us briefly try to visualize the tremendous loss by the World War and by the exploitation of the common people by the big rich during and since the war. The human mind is dazed by and can not at all grasp the loss caused by the World War.

It has been determined that if all those who lost their lives as the result of the World War were alive and marched single file past a certain point all day long from daylight until dark it would require four and one-half years for them to pass the designated point, and that for every life lost there was \$18,000 of property wasted and destroyed.

If \$1,000 had been burned every three minutes since the birth of Christ, no more money would have been burned by this time than was destroyed by the World War.

While this tremendous loss was taking place international bankers and monopolistic profiteers were getting possession of practically all of the wealth of the world that was not destroyed. Is there any wonder a panic came? Is there

any wonder these profiteers and their subsidized press wish to get the gaze of the public away from them and these awful facts?

Now, in order to cover their own awful and dastard crimes and in an effort to force Congress to give them a further strangle hold on the throats of the common people, these profiteers are resorting to every possible unfair and false criticism of Members of Congress.

This gang seeks to blacken the name of every Member who will not do their bidding, and by putting up campaign funds by organization and in the press they hold up as patriots of the first order those Members who get their orders from Wall Street and act accordingly.

Is there any wonder why these malefactors of good government and honest men and women do not want Members of Congress to be allowed to make reply on the floor of Congress through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and through free official mail service?

Can anyone fail to see the motive that prompts these modern pirates to oppose every move to advise the public of their outrageous crimes? They control most of the big newspapers, much of the radio service, and entirely too much of Congress, and desire that the common people have no voice in either the press, the radio service, or in legislative halls.

I knew full well my bill would be attacked bitterly and severely when I introduced the measure to save for the common people, the laboring man, the farmer, and the children, the greatest means of education, information, and communication of all time—the radio and the motion picture.

The radio itself was used four years ago to broadcast misrepresentations of my bill throughout the length and breadth of the country.

These criticisms at that time were made in reprisal against me for criticizing the Republican tariff bill.

More recently some of the big newspapers and periodicals, especially the Saturday Evening Post and other Curtis publications, have again taken up the misrepresentation of this bill and the vilification of me.

While I have great faith in the bill and am very hopeful that good legislation may some day soon be enacted along this line, I feel there are so many vitally important questions now before Congress that it is not best to push this bill at this time. For this reason, in spite of the many unfair attacks that have been made on me by the big newspapers, motion-picture concerns, and radio monopolies, I have refrained from attempting to pass this bill at this session of Congress. I reintroduced the bill at the beginning of this Congress, not because I felt it was an opportune time to pass it but because I did not want the radio, motion-picture, and other certain trusts and monopolies to feel that I had in any sense abandoned the fight for the real purposes of this bill.

I am only discussing this bill now because the vilification which these trusts are heaping on it demands, at least, some disclosure of the real truth concerning this measure.

To begin with, the bill does not appropriate any sum of money but only authorizes the appropriation of such money as may be necessary. If the bill should pass, only such money then could be appropriated as received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, the general House Committee on Appropriations, the House itself, and then similar committees of the Senate, the Senate, and finally the President.

So the misrepresentations as to the amount of appropriation included in the bill are fully exploded. These papers fail to tell the whole truth, and tell the people that the measure provides for free schoolbooks, and for radio and motion pictures, at much less cost to the public, making our people more patriotic rather than more criminal.

The bill would save these great agencies for all the people rather than let the monopolies use them, at tremendous cost to all the people, for the purpose of misrepresentation and the creation of a lower standard of morals.

This bill provides for the freest discussion of the rights and questions of interest to all the people and gives the poor people the use of the radio to present their ideas of government without hindrance and as fully as the richest man in the Nation. The bill seeks to destroy monopolies and to set up the will of the common people.

I shudder when I realize that we are nearing the time when monopolies will own practically everything, when we will have chain farming, chain banking, and chain everything else. When the big newspapers, the radio, the moving pictures, and even the books taught in our schools will be only such as are approved by the great financial interests; and our people will be treading the wine press of human misery and slavery from which there will be little or no liberation.

Of course, the big movie interests, which are largely responsible for the present great crime wave and which extract more money per year from our people for debauching our children than this entire program would cost, bitterly oppose my bill. They prefer, at tremendous cost to our fathers and mothers, to use their vile pictures to undo all the good influence of our homes and of our schools, make our children hate all that is highest and best, and clog our courts and prisons with young men and women who are worthy of a better fate.

The big radio interests join with the motion-picture interests in this fight. With them it is not a question of serving the children and helping their fathers and mothers build up and maintain a great citizenship. All these interests seek is money and more money, regardless of whether their methods produce ladies and gentlemen or beings in human form steeped in sin and crime.

The great interests oppose my bill and all similar moves for the dissemination of the truth. They prefer to control all means of communication and information to the end that they may without hindrance promulgate their ideas and destroy those who will not be subservient to them and their kind. The greatest salaries in the world are paid to movie actors and the greatest fortunes are made by motion-picture concerns. Who pays all this? The little boys and girls and their parents. What do they get in return? They get dirt and filth and the lowest possible conception of life.

Would it not be a thousand times better for clean, high-class, educational pictures to be furnished for far less cost to our people? To-day the common people are paying fabulous sums to the movies to undermine the home and its influence, set at naught the teachings of our fathers and mothers, undermine all law, and destroy our form of Government.

Why not pay much less for more love of father and mother, more respect for and love of home, more love of country and the God of our fathers? The newer and deeper patriotism would be worth the price. The higher and purer ideals instilled in our children would be worth many times the cost.

The savings of court costs and expense of crime would more than pay for all the expenditure.

I would, if possible, bring all the beauty of all the earth, all the music of all time, and all the blessings of all eternity and dump them in the laps of our boys and girls and their parents of the farm and of the humble home of honest labor. This can not be done fully in this life, but may be done in a small way, I hope and pray, by proper control or ownership by the people of the God-given blessings of earth and space and sky as exemplified in these modern inventions.

It will be seen that my bill carefully safeguards the right of each organization or community to select and approve the class and character of information or entertainments furnished for its own members or citizens. Anything else is dangerous to the American home, will destroy the moral stamina of our citizens, and will work the undoing of our Government.

The misrepresentations of the big papers concerning my bill have gone so far until some of my friends were led to believe my bill is contrary to the principle of separation

of church and state. There is no danger in the bill along this line. My bill gives the churches the same rights as other organizations. Many laws go much farther and give special rights to churches. Special reduced postal rates are given to church and fraternal newspapers, literature, and periodicals. Church edifices alone in the United States, to say nothing of other church property, to the amount of \$3,839,500,610 are relieved of all taxes.

Millions and billions are spent annually on public parks, orchestras, libraries, periodicals, and in numerous other ways for instruction, education, and entertainment. Only a few people enjoy these at great expense to whole people. I seek to make the best of all this available to all the people at the least possible cost.

I think my bill is good. I may be mistaken about it. The fight being made on it by the big interests confirms my faith in its provisions. I apologize for taking up so much time on these matters, but I feel it is dangerous to let too many false criticisms go without reply.

Before I conclude, let us take a peep at some of the inconsistencies of some of those who are criticizing Congress.

Nothing is more inconsistent, in so far as a newspaper is concerned, than the contention that while the United States Government is handling the newspapers and other periodicals of the country, through the Postal Service, at an actual loss of between ninety and a hundred million dollars per year, that the same Government should not handle its own official mail—parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD included—without cost to the official.

For the purpose of emphasis, I repeat it comes with poor grace for these big papers, especially, which get approximately \$100,000,000 a year graft or subsidy from the Government in the matter of postal rates in the handling of paid advertisements, unfair and untruthful criticisms of Members of Congress, and equally vicious propaganda against the rights of the common people, to object to Members of Congress answering this awful, untruthful vilification and sending it through the mail at an actual cost of about one-fifteenth of the amount actually lost by the Government in handling the newspapers of the country.

I am not criticizing the small local papers for taking advantage of the free-in-county postage or other cheap rates enjoyed by these little papers of our counties. I am defending them along with Members of Congress and others who must go up against the unfair criticisms and fight of the big metropolitan press.

If the big papers could not send their papers or periodicals thousands of miles through the mail practically free, all this slush would not load down our mails at the expense of the taxpayers and untold millions of dollars now paid out to these big papers for \$10,000-a-week and similarly expensive advertisements would go to the small weekly paper.

I favor the cheap postal rate for the country paper, so it can help overcome the false propaganda of the subsidized and monopolistic press of New York and other similar centers.

I am whole-heartedly in favor of the cheapest possible postal rates for county papers and for our State papers within the State; I favor the franking privilege of Members of Congress, and I am in favor of every other reasonable means of overcoming falsehood and letting the people know the truth.

The big magazines and periodicals which circulate so much false doctrine and misinformation enjoy a subsidy from the Government that staggers the imagination of those who now will have to help pay the bill by the change of first-class postage rates from 2 to 3 cents per ordinary letter.

Let us look at just a few figures. During a recent 10-year period the Postal Service of our Nation handled 14,590,410,689 pounds of this newspaper mail and received for the service \$292,900,498.17. I find that if the average citizens had mailed this same poundage in one-fourth ounce letters the postage would have been \$17,504,123,729.24, or more than five times as much as the newspapers paid.

This difference in favor of the newspapers, arising during one 10-year period since the war, would pay the balance due the World War veterans over and over more than five times. It is sufficient to pay the balance of the public debt.

If the 3-cent postage rate now being put into force had been in effect the difference, of course, would have been 50 per cent more. If the newspapers should pay as much per pound in postage during the next two years as the public will pay for similar poundage under the vicious 3-cent postage rate, the additional amount would more than pay the balance of adjusted compensation now due the veterans of the World War.

And yet, instead of favoring an increase of their postage, these papers oppose the payment of the soldiers' bonus, favor the increase of letter postage from 2 to 3 cents to pay the deficit caused by them, and will continue to unfairly abuse those who will not go with them and their gang in the sponsoring of this newspaper graft and similarly vicious outrages.

Let us for just a minute refer to the Curtis Publishing Co., which published in its Saturday Evening Post the article criticizing my free school radio educational bill.

Our people pay out of their pockets salaries and profits to the large newspaper organizations so large as to stagger the imagination, while our Government, through the Post Office Department, is losing \$3,000,000 per year hauling the publications of this one concern, namely, the Curtis Publishing Co.

Think of it, reliable information is available to the effect that this very paper, with all this Government subsidy, gets \$10,000 per week for one double-page advertisement, \$5,000 per week for single-page advertisements, and similarly large pay for all its advertising space.

The farmers and the average private citizens are being destroyed by these subsidies, exorbitant salaries of officials, of large business concerns, and an economic system which is slavery of the most vicious type. The common people pay for all this expensive advertising and for all these salaries and subsidies.

The big dailies look on approvingly and complacently while our Government donates billions upon top of billions of the people's money to foreign nations. Not a protest is heard from the metropolitan press when it is disclosed that \$30,000,000,000 have been recently swindled out of the American people and small banks by the big banks unloading this amount of worthless foreign securities on our people, with enormous commissions and profits to these pirates of the banking world.

Nothing was said by them while these blackest of all financial crimes transferred enough American money to foreign nations to pay the balance of adjusted compensation due the World War veterans again and again twenty times.

Yet the big press says "refuse to pay the World War veterans their pittance for all they have endured; but create the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and turn over to these identical financial pirates the people's money in \$200,000,000 blocks." They say unanimously "the great banks and other enormous financial institutions must be relieved of all burdens of taxation, such as income, estate, and inheritance taxes, and the sales tax must do the work by taxing need, want, poverty, and despair, instead of wealth, plenty, income, and swollen, stolen enormous fortunes." And yet this big-newspaper, big-interest mob seeks to ruthlessly murder those who do not do its will and who in spite of their threats vote for the best interest of the American people as pointed out by conscientious convictions.

The big subsidized press and the gang of international and other Wall Street bankers that buys them with stolen loot attempt to decoy the attention of an outraged and indignant public away from the oceans tied on to oceans of their own guilt and to fasten attention on the fleeting vapor of some imaginary indiscretion of some public official.

Those who stole and now control the wealth and destiny of the world are seeking to cause all humanity to look for the causes of the present depression in a few grains of in-

consequential shifting sands instead of in the mighty mountains piled upon never-ending mountains of their own awful crime and guilt. With the blackest crime of all ages fastened on them and their kind and with their hands dripping with the innocent blood of millions and billions of their fellow men, dead and living, these financial enemies of the race seek to destroy those who will neither join their gang nor help them in the concealment of their own awful calamitous guilt.

Thus it is I am most anxious to save for the common people the radio, the motion pictures, the independent small country newspaper, the independent educational system of our country schools, and the absolute right of Members of Congress to speak for the masses of our people and broadcast their speeches to all the people.

Without these agencies there would be neither freedom of the press nor freedom of speech, and there would be the immediate disappearance of freedom of religion and all other God-given constitutional rights.

There is and can be no freedom of a subsidized money-owned press. There can be no free speech without a free press and the right of the people's representatives in Congress and elsewhere to not only speak for them but to let the world know what is said and done in Congress and elsewhere.

We must fight as never before to regain what has been stolen from our people, to right the wrong so far as possible and to build stronger our every bulwark of liberty and honest government so that such a thing will never occur again.

Let me repeat what I said in the beginning of these remarks. Let those who wish to criticize Members of Congress single out the one against whom the dart is aimed and specifically point out wherein his official record is thought to be bad.

I implore those who wish to attack me to please point out wherein they feel they would have improved the record I made, which of my votes are believed by them to be wrong, what utterances of mine in debate are opposed by them, and what proposals of mine are offensive to them.

Many, many thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tell of my work here. I am, though, sorely disappointed over what has been accomplished by Congress during all these years. I am glad that in the midst of opposition and criticism I have stood for the right as pointed out by the dictates of my own conscience.

I have fought for much that has not been accomplished, but which I hope may yet be brought into being before many more months. Just here let me name briefly some principles for which I have contended, which I now propose to the platform builders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, as well as those who wish to run for Congress this year and all who may now or hereafter be interested either in their own political preferment or in the welfare of the American people.

I respectfully submit the following suggestions:

First. I favor the submission to the States of an amendment to the Federal Constitution to provide for the head of each family an exemption from all taxes of a reasonable amount of realty and personalty for a comfortable home when so used.

Second. I favor legislation bringing about an effective control of the production and marketing of farm products by the producers, by a contract system, allotment plan, cooperative marketing, or other proper device, to the end that the price of farm products may be elevated, controlled, and stabilized by the farmers as fully and completely as the production, marketing, and prices of manufactured and other articles of barter and sale are controlled by manufacturers and other producers. This, and only this, will put the farmers on a parity with other enterprises and constitute real farm relief.

Third. Except in cases of extreme emergency, I favor the raising of all revenues for the Federal Government from impost duties; tariffs; estate, inheritance, and income taxes, to

the end that the several States may levy and collect excise and general sales taxes if it is desired by the State governments to do so in lieu of the whole or any part of the now burdensome State ad valorem or property tax.

Fourth. I favor the completion as soon as possible of the system of waterways along the Atlantic seaboard for use by barges and other small watercraft, and the similar system of inland waterways along the Gulf of Mexico, including the construction of a connecting link between the two systems across south Georgia and north Florida along the most practical route.

Fifth. I favor the working out through Government aid of a system of selling fruits, vegetables, and other food products of the farm, orchard, and dairy more directly from the producer to the consumer, thus giving better, fresher, and more wholesome food to the consumers at less cost and at the same time securing a much more reasonable price for the producers.

Sixth. I favor the immediate solution of the transportation problem. The railroads should be saved as a part and parcel of the economic structure of our States and Nation. They should be given a square deal, to the end that they may not only furnish full and adequate transportation facilities to all the people but help furnish employment to labor, bear a large part of the tax burden of the States and Nation, and generally constitute a most important factor in the financial structure of the country.

To these ends I favor the immediate enactment of legislation putting bus and truck transportation under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with such laws, however, as will prevent unfair treatment of any transportation line or any consolidations or mergers or other manipulations inimical to the general welfare.

Seventh. I favor an arrangement between a proper governmental agency and all holders of long-term loans against farm property and all holders of farm property recently taken over by foreclosure proceedings, whereby all farm lands so taken over, together with all lands now covered by long-term loans, will be returned to original owners or held by original owners without foreclosures, except where such arrangement is not practical or not desired by original owner. In order to carry this fully into effect, I favor the issuance and sale of such Government bonds as may be necessary, the bonds for this purpose to be secured by the loans, lands, or other property purchased, handled, or sold in the carrying of this program into full effect.

These suggestions are not at all exhaustive. They show, though, how I feel about these most vital issues. At a later date, and before adjournment of this session, I hope to discuss these issues more fully.

NATURALIZATION LAWS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 6477) to further amend the naturalization laws, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

COPYRIGHT LAWS

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 229 (Report No. 1382)

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12094, a bill "To amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to codify and amend common-law rights of authors in their writings."

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Patents, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, on to-morrow it is expected to take up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4668) to amend section 3 of the flood control act. The bill comes up under a rule, and I am advised it will probably require two or three hours. After that time I shall presently propound a unanimous-consent request to call the Private Calendar, and that it be in order to recess until 8 o'clock and to call the Private Calendar from 8 o'clock until 10.30; and on Saturday of this week under the new rule it will be in order to call the Private Calendar, and that on Saturday there will be no controversial matters brought up, and nothing except the Private Calendar.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that on to-morrow, after the consideration of the bill H. R. 4688, it shall be in order to consider bills on the Private Calendar under the new rule, and that it shall be in order for the House to recess until 8 o'clock p. m., and to consider bills on the Private Calendar from 8 o'clock p. m. until 10.30 p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the first portion of the request, that for the balance of to-morrow the Private Calendar be considered, but it is too hard on the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and other Members who work on the Private Calendar, to sit here, under a terrible strain, and work on that bunch of bills during the day session and then again at night also.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There will be no session on Saturday, will there?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; there will be a session on Saturday. There is a limit to what an individual can do, Mr. Speaker, and men will be dropping off here again. They are not able to stand the day and night session work, and then keep their offices going, hence I shall object. The first part of the gentleman's request, that we consider private bills during the rest of the day, I do not object to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall divide the request, and I hope that the gentleman will not object to considering the Private Calendar under the new rule on Saturday.

Mr. BLANTON. Not at all.

Mr. RAINEY. With the understanding that no controversial matters are to come up. I understand the gentleman will not make a point of no quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will not make any such reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. That is one lever necessary to protect the country sometimes. I shall not waive the right to exercise that privilege, and reserve the right to make such a point of order whenever it appears to be necessary.

Mr. RAINEY. The only reason I suggested a night session was because I thought some gentleman on Saturday might raise a point of no quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. It may be that some question would arise where we would be compelled to make that point of no quorum as the only means left to stop some bad bill from passing. This new rule under which we must operate on Private Calendar day is going to double, and even treble, the amount of work that we who watch this calendar must perform. Even after we do the hard, grinding work it is going to be absolutely impossible to stop all of the bad bills, and some of them are going to get by, and the Public Treasury is going to suffer. It is going to be necessary to have our entire objecting force on the floor at all times while the Private Calendar is being considered, and I know that if it is taken up at night sessions with the membership worked down, some of our forces are going to be absent. And thus it is because I deem it necessary to protect the Treasury that I object to such a proposed night session, and for no

other reason. I work, myself, every night, as I work afterwards in my office, even when I attend some function, hence I do not object for any personal reason.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas, I amend my unanimous-consent request by omitting the night session.

Mr. HASTINGS. Reserving the right to object, where do we begin on the Private Calendar?

Mr. RAINEY. The rule provides that the calendar shall be called in numerical order. That is a matter for the Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS. But do we begin where we left off?

Mr. RAINEY. I shall not pass on that, because the rule provides that the Private Calendar shall be called in numerical order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Under the rule, if there be no agreement, where would we begin on the Private Calendar? Will we begin at the first number or where we left off on the last call?

The SPEAKER. Under the new rules, the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. If the Chair understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], the gentleman desired to consider bills in the House as in Committee of the Whole, from the time the flood control bill is disposed of until the House takes a recess.

Mr. RAINEY. Until the House adjourns. I amend the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Until the House adjourns. One objection would suffice. Is that correct?

Mr. SNELL. I do not understand the request that way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAINEY. No. Under the new rule, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under the general rules of the House, the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar, and will start at the beginning of the calendar.

The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the consideration of the flood control bill on to-morrow, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar, and to continue until the House adjourns. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARGUMENT AGAINST GRANTING A RULE ON H. R. 11677

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and that I be permitted to print a statement which I filed with the Committee on Rules, together with a financial exhibit referring to that statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, what does the statement cover?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. It is with reference to H. R. 11677, the railroad bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that no exhibit can be printed in the Record without special permission from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. It is simply a condensed financial statement that I have called for from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. It would be proper to print such a statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was so much confusion that I did not understand exactly the gentleman's request. I thought I heard the gentleman mention something about the Committee on Rules.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. There is a rule pending, or a request for a rule from the Committee on Rules, with reference to the so-called Rayburn bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I filed a statement with the committee to-day in opposition to the rule. I am asking leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including that statement, together with the financial statement referred to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gone before the Committee on Rules to request a rule to bring before the House H. R. 11677.

Being very much opposed to this measure, I have filed a statement with the Committee on Rules, believing that such rule should not be granted. In order that the House itself may be able to understand what this bill is, as I see it, I have asked leave to print my protest in the RECORD with exhibits.

ARGUMENT AGAINST GRANTING A RULE ON H. R. 11677

I can not support H. R. 11677 because, to my mind, it is class legislation—wholly a prorailroad measure. I am not opposed to scrapping the present Esch-Cummins law. It, too, has always been regarded a prorailroad measure.

The bill before us repeals, in part, the Sherman antitrust law in recognizing holding companies; fixes a new rule of rate making certainly not opposed by the railroads; pigeon-holes the La Follette valuation plan; repeals section 15a, the recapture clause; and hands over \$360,000,000 to rich roads, bankers, big corporations, coal and steel companies, and Morgan interests. To my mind, it contains not one single added benefit for the business man, laboring man, or the farmer who must pay the freight and fares.

WHY GUARANTY CLAUSE FAILED

The so-called guaranty provision of the Esch-Cummins law was fathered and pushed through Congress by the security owners, and actively supported by railroad executives, because they thought that the recapture provision would prove to be in fact a guaranty to the railroads of 6 per cent on property value. The late Senator La Follette, farm organizations, and the public generally believed that it contained a guaranty. In fact, so did the security owners themselves. Consequently, La Follette and many others, including myself, opposed it. Now, the reason that the security owners and railroad interests generally are for repeal is because the so-called guaranty has not worked as they hoped it would. Falling off of passenger traffic, competing transportation agencies, floods, droughts, crop failures are given as reasons why the railroads as a whole did not realize the profits they expected from this apparent guaranty. But the real reason it failed is because it violated a fundamental principle; it intended to give the railroad interests a permanent fixed profit, a special privilege. It died of its own poison.

SPECIAL INTERESTS OPPOSE RECAPTURE

Why do security owners and railway executives favor this bill? Two reasons are on the surface. They would escape the payment in the future of from thirty to forty millions annually, and get the three hundred and sixty millions due the Government in recapture liability.

The big shippers are for repeal, because, as they said in the hearings, through their attorney, they expect a special benefit. The attorney was asked, "Could you tell, in just a word, how all these things are going to help the shippers, briefly?" He answered, "They are going to help the shippers because they will help to improve the railroad credit."

He was asked, "Is that all?" His answer was: "That is one reason. They are going to help the shippers, because they will assist the railroads in getting back where they can buy some of our goods." (P. 100, hearings.)

Note that, throughout, his testimony is prorailroad. Nothing is directly presented to show how this gift of three hun-

dred and sixty millions would redound to the shippers generally.

Naturally, the rich Class I railroads—those whose annual income is no less than a million dollars—plead, as did the representative of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, for "fairness to the railroads" and the "unconditional and retroactive repeal of the recapture provisions."

As an illustration of the sheer selfishness of these railroads who appeared before the committee pleading for charity, let us take this particular road. It owes the Government in round numbers \$11,000,000 under the recapture clause. (See hearings, p. 556, No. 8.) Its corporate surplus—cash or other assets after all debts are subtracted—December 31, 1930, was approximately four hundred and five millions. It had increased to this figure from one hundred and seventy-two millions in 1920, and even from three hundred and ninety-eight millions at the close of 1929, showing indisputably its increasing wealth. The dividends declared on its stock have constantly increased from 6 per cent on common and a total amount declared in the sum of \$19,649,795 in the year 1920, to 10 per cent on common and a total amount declared in the sum of \$30,380,401 in the year 1930. (P. 378, hearings.)

Can not such a road afford to pay the Government its just due—in this case only \$11,000,000—of the excess earnings that have enabled it to show such large corporate increases? Does this road need a gift?

Now, let us examine the data in connection with other roads:

Name of road	Estimated recapture liability, 1920-1930	Corporate surplus, 1930	Amount dividends, 1930	Rate per cent common dividends, 1930	Page of hearings
Chesapeake & Ohio	\$47,779,611	\$175,629,633	\$17,110,449	10	387
Norfolk & Western	42,105,462	202,140,584	17,797,488	12	404
Southern Ry. Co.	15,838,881	109,373,546	18,350,038	11.65	412
Union Pacific	8,363,047	250,410,091	26,210,884	10	419
New York Central	4,842,577	290,275,411	39,940,594	8	369
Baltimore & Ohio	3,211,587	109,861,329	20,295,215	7	384
Great Northern	782,730	164,905,196	18,673,035	7.5	391
Southern Pacific	452,089	299,563,906	22,342,908	6	411

* See hearings, pp. 556, 557, Nos. 1, 2, 5, 12, 18, 25, 53, and 62.

Of course the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners is for the bill. Bear in mind that some members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are also members of the national association. We do not know how much their action is influenced by the commission, if at all; but we do know that their representative stated in the hearings that—

The association comes here to support, in the main, the recommendations * * * which have been made by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is for it. This commission, to my mind, has been exceedingly dilatory in determining and taking means to collect the recapture liabilities. I have been led to wonder if my colleague, Representative JAMES M. BECK, member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was far from right when last summer, in connection with the "15 per cent case," he threatened investigation of the commission if it did not act with more speed. He called it a "Commission of Circumlocution" (Washington Post, July 15, 1931). Even Commissioner Woodlock, while still one of their number, said in 1930, in a dissenting opinion referring mainly to valuation:

I am driven to the supposition that the "unworkability" of the law of the land arises less from the difficulty inherent in its application than from an indisposition to apply it and accept the results. (Special Report of Interstate Commerce Commission to Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, May 17, 1930.)

The simple fact is, as is apparent all the way through, that the commission has snarled itself up because of its own inactivity and errors in judgment. Now, it is asking for authority virtually to do as it pleases. It is proposed to substitute men for law, discretion for direction, opinion for principle. As Commissioner Eastman testified, with ref-

erence to one of the bills which is virtually embodied in this measure, "the commission is to be guided" by "a barometer of earnings," and he added, "although in no inflexible way." But the bill itself shows that the way is wholly flexible, and the commission is relieved entirely of the recapture work and practically of valuation. In short, in this measure the commission is given carte blanche as to making rates, except for the suggestion that they must be sure that the railroads get enough.

TIME AND COST TO COMPLETE RECAPTURE NEGLIGIBLE

Why should this valuable work of recapture now be scrapped when the work is nearly completed? Commissioner Eastman, when asked at the hearings how long it would take to complete the recapture work, answered:

Our bureau of valuation estimates that the time required would be up to July 1, 1935. (Hearings, p. 438.)

As to the cost of recapture, which has been made to appear so formidable, I quote Commissioner Lewis's recent statement in the hearings (1932) on independent offices appropriations:

We estimate that the net cost allocable to recapture for the completion of the work [meaning the ascertained and computed three hundred and sixty millions] * * * will be \$4,000,000 over a period ending June 30, 1935 (p. 293).

Is it wise economy to waste what has already been spent in millions of dollars and labor of years by Government accountants in complying with the law when it will take only three years more and require only four millions to recuperate three hundred and sixty millions?

AN ADDITIONAL FAVOR TO THE ROADS

Another provision which will be affected by the repeal is the requirement that the railroads must keep one-half of the excess earnings in their own reserve fund. The law now gives them this amount for the specific purpose of "paying dividends or interest on its stocks, bonds, or other securities, or rent for leased roads," and for no other purpose. The other half is allotted to the Government for another purpose—that is, to create a contingent fund for "making loans to carriers to meet expenditures for capital account or to refund maturing securities originally issued for capital account, or by purchasing transportation equipment and facilities and leasing the same to carriers." So that by repealing this part of section 15a, Congress not only gives away the contingent fund that the Government should be holding, which now amounts to three hundred and sixty millions, but also releases an equal amount which the railroads should be holding as trust funds for specified purposes. These purposes were intended to strengthen the roads so as to keep them from asking for more favors from the Government.

GIVES AWAY TRUST FUNDS

It might be a question whether the railroads' one-half of the recapture is a trust fund. The majority report does refer to it as funds "in trust." Unquestionably, however, the three hundred and sixty millions due the Government are trust funds. The interstate commerce act so states. It says that "any carrier which receives such funds in excess of their returns shall hold the same 'as trustee' for and shall pay it to the United States."

The Supreme Court has ruled that this money is a trust fund:

The statute declared the carrier to be only a trustee for the excess over a fair return received by it. Though in its possession, the excess never becomes its property and it accepts custody of the products of all the rates with this understanding. (Dayton-Goose Creek v. United States, 263 U. S. 456.)

To whom would these trust funds be given by this measure? Not to the weaker roads for whose benefit they were to be held in trust and to whom loans were to be made from this emergency trust fund; not to the farmers and business men who paid the money into the trust funds in the form of higher freight rates and passenger fares. These trust funds would be given to the roads that collected these fares and rates from the people. The Supreme Court said "the excess never becomes its property and it accepts custody of the

products of all the rates with this understanding." (Dayton-Goose Creek v. United States, supra.)

Think of it! These trust funds, by this measure, are to be a gift to the trustees, custodians, collectors! If they are to be diverted from their intended purpose, why not turn these trust funds into the Treasury for all the people?

THE LID IS OFF

This bill takes the lid off. There is a limit now to the earnings of railroads. They are not to charge rates that will net them more than 6 per cent. If they do, one-half is to be a reserve fund held for themselves for a specific purpose, and the other half a trust fund paid into the Treasury to constitute a contingent fund, now estimated by the Interstate Commerce Commission to be \$360,000,000. By this measure the earnings may be not only 6 per cent but 60 per cent if they could make it. They may charge what the traffic will bear. The public's only protection is that the Interstate Commerce Commission, unrestrained by any specific direction, but prompted to watch that the railroads get profits enough, will watch the "barometer of earnings." In fact, this bill, in "restraining" excess fares and rates, makes the sky the limit.

BENEFICIARIES WOULD BE RICH ROADS

The big coal and steel roads are principal contributors to this recapture trust. A group of four coal roads operating in the Virginias, part of which are controlled by the Van Sweringen interests, are estimated by the commission as owing this Government about \$102,000,000.

Estimated recapture liabilities

Chesapeake & Ohio	\$47,779,611
Hocking Valley	5,241,114
Norfolk & Western	42,106,462
Virginian	7,364,770
	102,491,957

(Hearings, p. 556, Nos. 1, 2, 14, and 15.)

This is 28 per cent of the total amount of estimated recapture liability. From a group of roads controlled by the United States Steel Corporation is an estimated recapture liability of more than fifty-two millions (see total, hearings, p. 436), or 14 per cent of the whole. Together these make 42 per cent of all the recapture figured to be due the Government for the period covering 1920-1930.

During this time the total net income (meaning profit after interest, dividends, and all fixed charges are deducted) of this group of coal roads has been more than five hundred and fifty-four millions, and of the group of steel roads one hundred and seventy-three millions. The corporate surpluses for the year 1930 were, for the coal group, four hundred and thirty-one millions, and for the steel group one hundred and seventy millions. The coal group paid dividends on their common stock in 1930, ranging from 8 per cent to 12 per cent. The rate of dividends of a few of the steel roads is astounding. The Bessemer & Lake Erie was paying from 1920 to 1930, inclusive, dividends ranging from 150 per cent to the peaks of 500 per cent in 1928 and 1929, and 400 per cent in 1930. (Hearings, pp. 373 and 434-436.)

Is it the will of the people or the will of the United States Congress that these rich coal and steel roads, through repeal of recapture, shall be given a "dole" of 42 per cent of these trust funds, amounting to one hundred and fifty-four millions, that belong to the Government?

Of the recapture liability estimated at three hundred and sixty millions, ten millions have been paid. (Exhibit I.) Assuredly, to take these ten millions already collected with interest (in all thirteen millions) out of the United States Treasury and make it a subsidy to the rich railroads would be not only a "dole" but a raid on the Government's trust fund.

VALUATION AS BASIS OF RATES—NOT DISCRETION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The people's interest will be safeguarded only if valuation is the basis of rates. The bill cuts out rate groups and fair value and leaves as a basis of rate making nothing more definite than "just and reasonable" return based on a

system of "bookkeeping" supplied by the railroads. That some check by the Government is necessary for the protection of shippers and the general public is evident from the following quotations from the 1908 Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as cited by Commissioner Lewis, who for nine years has been in charge of the Bureau of Valuation of the commission:

It is sufficient for the present purpose to state that no tribunal upon which the duty may be imposed, whether legislative, administrative, or judicial, can pass a satisfactory judgment upon the reasonableness of railway rates without taking into account the value of railway property.

No court, or commission, or accountant, or financial writer would for a moment consider that the present balance-sheet statement purporting to give the "cost of property" suggests, even in a remote degree, a reliable measure either of money invested or of present value. (Pp. 527-528, Hearings.)

A portion of the valuation work is to be kept up, it is true, but may be stored away in a closet to be referred to only if some extraordinary emergency should arise. Under this bill the whole matter of rates would be left to the discretion of a commission, "a purely political tribunal" of 11 men. Rates that are fair are not so likely to come out of a debating society as from the administration of a scientific law.

The work of valuation, urged and sponsored by the late Senator La Follette and by the Interstate Commerce Commission itself, is, as Commissioner Lewis has said, "the largest undertaking of valuation the world has ever known." It has enabled the commission and overcapitalized roads to work together for a sounder financial structure. Valuation is essential to every emergency that might arise for railway legislation and railway regulation. Concerning the present status of the work of valuation, Commissioner Lewis said recently:

... the Government is now in the position not only to furnish a valuation base for rates, but equipped to meet any question that might be raised as to confiscation resulting from rates. (Hearings before the subcommittee on appropriations on the Independent Offices bill, p. 281.)

Even now the Interstate Commerce Commission is using valuation as a basis for approving loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This monumental achievement of the late Senator La Follette is to go into a pigeonhole so far as recapture and rate making are concerned because between the commission and the Supreme Court its intended efficacy has been seriously impaired.

Before the Senator died I was expressing to him my discouragement of all reforms by laws where the men who are not favorable to the law would wreck it—make it a failure by mismanagement. "Yes," said he, "see what this Interstate Commerce Commission has done with my railroad valuation."

My opinion is that the commission is to blame because of its failure to present the valuation plan to the courts adequately. The O'Fallon case alone in all this time has gone to the Supreme Court. If legislation is necessary to perfect the La Follette plan, it should be recommended by the committee. But to wreck this legislative structure so nearly completed and so exceedingly necessary would, to my mind, be the height of legislative folly.

As to the cost of completing the work of valuation, I again quote Commissioner Lewis:

We have already got the records and we have checked these properties up to 1928, and for some roads we have got it up to the end of 1931, and when we get it current, why, a great deal of expense is over, both for the Government and for the carriers. (P. 281, hearings, independent offices appropriation bill.)

Since valuation is nearly completed, and the cost of keeping it up to date is negligible, we should not leave the whole matter of rate making to the discretion of a commission which is directed by a rule requiring them continually to keep railroad interests in mind.

REGULATION OF HOLDING COMPANIES AN EMPTY GESTURE

Twenty-five years ago Wisconsin took the lead in regulating utilities, and recently its legislature has passed the most

comprehensive law yet written for the control of holding companies in connection with utilities. The principle embodied in regulating railroad holding companies by the Interstate Commerce Commission, like the principle of regulating the railroads themselves, is not new, but identical with what is applied to the regulation of utilities. Such corporations now control hundreds of millions of the people's money. Prof. William Z. Ripley, director of the Rock Island, said:

The late unprecedented creation of hierarchies of corporations piled helter-skelter, one upon another—wheels within wheels—is utterly opposed to sound public policy. There is no legal or operating need of it. The rightful interests of shippers, employees, and of owners of railroad securities are all alike put in jeopardy by the practice. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 4, 1932, p. 7357.)

I agree with Prof. Adolph Berle, of Columbia Law School, that "the holding company stands foremost among the so-called legal devices for undue control of corporations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 4, 1932, p. 7358). The holding company provision in this bill specifically "relieves them from the operation of the 'antitrust law'." (Sec. 2, par. 15.) Their grab-as-grab-can practices are what is called "above our Federal law." For instance, a few big railroad executives with a few big bank executives may constitute a holding company. They may buy and control at will the stock of some road which will be advantageous to the corporation, depress it, inflate it, even force receivership, if necessary. They even manipulate stock as buyer and seller, thereby reaping enormous profits. These fly-by-nights tend towards consolidation, which, regulated or unregulated, destroys healthy competition. This measure, to my mind, authorizes holding companies as a lawful institution by the device of passing a law to regulate them. The only restraint is the arbitrary discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Is it wise, I repeat, thus to substitute the government of man for the government of law? Can they stand the pressure? I doubt it. Watch what will happen when the camel gets his nose into the tent. I am opposed to consolidation. I favor prohibiting holding companies, not their recognition as an institution, by passing a law to regulate them.

PLEA OF EMERGENCY NEED IS SPECIOUS

While we are willing to admit that railroads are suffering the pinch of the depression along with the rest of the country, in the shrinkage of their volume of business, are they in any greater financial distress than are practically all other industries? Except for bad management, extravagance, and speculation, they should not be in such dire distress as they would have us believe, for they have been the recipients of stupendous sums of Government money. When they were turned back to private ownership in 1920, they claimed reimbursement of deficit in railway-operating income during Federal control of nearly \$29,000,000.

The Government compromised with them by making a total settlement of approximately ten millions. As a six months' guaranty from March 1, 1920, after the termination of Federal control, the Government paid the railroads nearly five hundred and twenty-nine millions. At that time, also, to help the roads over the transition period a revolving fund of \$300,000,000 was appropriated from the Treasury. (Source of above figures, annual reports of Interstate Commerce Commission.) To meet the present emergency there could have been a fund available. Had the \$360,000,000 due the Government in recapture been collected, as it should have been, there would have been no need for the railroads, demanding a 15 per cent blanket increase on rates or for the Railroad Credit Corporation (the "credit pool"), which was established pursuant to the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission of October 16, 1931. Already from this pool the railroads have received a little over four millions, with fourteen and one-fourth millions authorized. All of this comes directly out of increased rates. There would have been no need for that part of the \$2,000,000,000 fund of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that is allocated for loans to railroads.

From this Government fund the railroads have already received seventy-seven and one-half millions.

What have the class I roads done with the sixty-six billions that they received during their prosperous period between 1920 and 1930? (Exhibit II.) Only one one-hundred and ninety-eighth part of these revenues is payable to the Government in recapture. If they had conserved this money, they could not now plead that they have no funds with which to pay recapture. As Commissioner Eastman well said, "Undoubtedly a general railroad contingent fund of \$300,000,000 or thereabouts would now be very useful if it were available." (Hearings, p. 11.)

Now that this depression has come, this cry for help has gone out and the Congress is to rush to the assistance of the railroads. From a reliable source I quote the following:

Railroads since the 1920 act made the best showing in their history. If we eliminate from the transportation picture those ill-conceived, poorly built, and badly finished parts of our transportation system, we begin to get at the real trouble. Why try to design laws which will saddle on the people of this country a sponsorship for those proverbial "ne'er-do-wells" of the railroad family? There is little that can be done for the professional hobo or that army of unemployed whose only aspiration in life is a handout. It is to those who would work if they could get something to do that our efforts to better the opportunities of the human family are directed.

It is shown below that our really worth-while railroads were treated even generously, in so far as rates and regulations are concerned, during the period subsequent to March 1, 1920, when the so-called transportation act of 1920 became effective.

(1) Average annual dividend rate paid on dividend-yielding stock:

1920 to 1930, 7.30 per cent.
1910 to 1920, 6.94 per cent.
1900 to 1910, 6.20 per cent.
1890 to 1900, 5.40 per cent.

(2) Maximum and minimum dividend rate paid on dividend-yielding stocks:

1920 to 1930, 6.37 per cent in 1924 to 9.02 per cent in 1921.
1910 to 1920, 6.29 per cent in 1916 to 8.03 per cent in 1911.
1900 to 1910, 5.23 per cent in 1900 to 8.07 per cent in 1908.
1890 to 1900, 4.96 per cent in 1899 to 5.74 per cent in 1895.

(3) Average annual per cent of all stock which was on a dividend-yielding basis:

1920 to 1930, 56.92 per cent in 1921 to 76.93 per cent in 1930.
1910 to 1920, 57.30 per cent in 1920 to 67.65 per cent in 1911.
1900 to 1910, 45.66 per cent in 1900 to 67.27 per cent in 1907.
1890 to 1900, 29.83 per cent in 1896 to 45.66 per cent in 1900.

The rates and regulations imposed upon railroads as a result of the act of 1920 certainly brought about the best results ever achieved in the history of transportation, evidenced by the results obtained in these three tabulations. The value of securities of railroads should have been at a peak in all history during the past 10 years. The ability of a corporation to pay its fixed charges and also declare substantial dividends are usually the two essentials which financial houses, brokers, stock and bond salesmen, and managers point to with pride when they try to entice the dollars of the public from the security of the savings banks and safe-deposit boxes and other conservative places of repose. The greatest improvement in the physical property of the railroads in their history occurred in the period 1920 to 1930.

From these figures and facts how clearly apparent it is that this emergency plea is specious!

EMERGENCY PERIOD NO TIME FOR PERMANENT LEGISLATION

This emergency period, when the railroads for a short time are suffering from the depression, is seized upon as the propitious time for passing this bill in their favor. Commissioner Lewis, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, expressed his disapproval of such legislation:

* * * should we be carried * * * to making changes in the law of a permanent character to apply to normal times * * * that we would not make in what we term normal times. (Hearings, p. 526.)

This problem should be more carefully studied. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should appoint a special committee to sit during the summer, call before it every possible authority and expert, and consider all the essential facts in the light of the common good as well as the special interests of the railroads. Then they would be able to recommend a safe and practical principle of rate making. Then, upon the arrival of better times, in the light of normal conditions, they should formulate permanent railway legislation.

The members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee itself had no time under the stress and strain of the extraordinary pressure of this session to give this matter sufficient consideration, and surely Members of Congress not on the committee in the closing days of this session can not be expected to give it the attention its importance demands. Are not the railroads taking advantage of this depression to get sympathy and more special favors? President Hoover has stated a few weeks ago, as reported in the press, after a careful survey of the railroad situation, that they are not so bad off as first appeared. He said:

I have held a number of conferences for survey of the railway situation and for determination of general policies in respect to the railroads. The elements in these conferences are the directors and heads of staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, members of the Interstate Commerce Commission dealing with these problems, and representatives of the Railway Credit Corporation.

Examination of the financial problem confronting the railroads shows that it is of smaller dimensions than has been generally believed or reported. (United States Daily, March 21, 1932.)

Why is this favoritism to be shown to one class of our people—the bond and stock holders of railroads? Was not agriculture the first to suffer in the fall of price levels? Has it not been for years in a "state of unprecedented collapse and prostration"?

RAILWAY INEFFICIENCY, EXTRAVAGANCE, AND BAD MANAGEMENT REWARDED

One of the specious arguments is that we must hasten to turn over these three hundred and sixty millions because recapture leads to extravagance. In the hearings Commissioner Eastman uses this as an argument for repeal. He quotes a statement from the 1919 report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the effect that the—prospect of sharing the surplus with the Government, or with labor, leads to extravagance in expenditures. (Hearings, p. 4.)

Just to show you what would happen if valuation were eliminated, I want to call your attention to one instance where the railroads have taken advantage of an antiquated classification of accounts—1907—by slipping in under operating expenses a billion dollars or more annually of superior roadbed improvement on which they escape recapture. They do this by a series of replacements, working up gradually to the highest grade of heavy rails and treated ties. Now, if it were not for the depression, they would be realizing on this investment—because no more replacement is needed—sufficiently to throw them into considerable recapture. Of course, they want the law repealed so that these profits will be their own. They have paid for these billions in improvements out of the people's money. I called for data from the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to this subterfuge. While the figure they furnished, \$21,215,274—Exhibit III—relates to only 3 per cent of the mileage of the United States and covers about one-half the years since the transportation act was passed, yet on this basis the billion a year is not exaggerated if all facts were available and could be ascertained by laborious accounting methods. I have seen calculations from a reliable source which assert that if all other items of improvement were included which have slipped by under such swelled operating expenses they would amount not to one billion but to several billions for the period that recapture has been a law.

Other witnesses, attorneys of the special interests pleading for this bill, also urge extravagance as a reason for repealing the recapture clause. But are we to reward these railroads with the gift of 360 millions? Is that the remedy? Our United States Supreme Court in the Dayton-Goose Creek case, supra, said:

Those who earn more must hold one-half of the excess primarily to preserve their sound economic condition and avoid wasteful expenditures and unwise dividends.

It is easy to quote the testimony of competent men as to railroad extravagance over a long period. Back in 1910,

Justice Brandeis, then attorney for the Interstate Commerce Commission, in a rate-increase case said:

The railroads are wasting \$1,000,000 a day. Were efficient methods of operation adopted, it would not be necessary for the transportation lines to increase rates. Instead, they could be decreased and at the same time the railroads could show a larger margin of profit than now is realized. (*La Follette's Magazine*, December 24, 1910.)

Mr. Brandeis, at that time, introduced testimony to prove the statement.

The late Senator La Follette foresaw the effect of the Esch-Cummins law in this respect, for he said:

But with the Esch-Cummins law on the books, the public has a vital interest in these criminally lavish expenditures, because the public pays the bill * * * the cost of maintenance is advanced three-quarters of a billion dollars in one year on the item of repair work on engines and cars alone. * * * This is one angle of the repair scandal. (*La Follette's Magazine*, January, 1921, p. 2.)

But that extravagance and mismanagement of railways is not confined to these last 10 years is evident from this statement, made by Henry Ford in 1921:

The big lines are not being run correctly. Those who own them care more about the market value and market manipulations of their stock than they do about giving service to the people. Those who operate them from high positions are being paid too highly for the little they know and do. Railroad, I have found, is one of the most inefficiently conducted businesses in the world to-day. (*La Follette's Magazine*, November, 1921, p. 164.)

It seems to me a curious sort of logic or ethics that mismanagement and inefficiency and deception of the public should be rewarded rather than penalized. Moreover, it is an absurd assumption that the cure for this continued inefficiency, mismanagement, and extravagance is a gift of more money from the United States Treasury.

Two questions come to my mind when I consider such testimony as this from these authorities. What is our Interstate Commerce Commission doing all this time? In view of these practices heretofore and since, have the commissioners given such evidence of reliability and efficiency that we should intrust them with further discretionary power? And how long shall we rush to the assistance of the railroads with funds out of the National Treasury?

H. R. 9551—NELSON BILL

I am not on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I do not pretend to be a railroad expert, but I have made a study of railroad legislation, and I could see from following the hearings that this demand for railroad legislation was largely *ex parte*. I wished the committee to have more material before it. So I asked the Interstate Commerce Commission for specific data relative to the 446 railroads having "estimated recapture liability." (P. 347, Hearings on H. R. 7116 and 7117.)

My requests of the commission were as follows:

First. Roads which have paid recapture and amount paid by each road.

Second. Roads which have had hearings or upon which reports have been served.

Third. Roads which are under suspicion or which the commission has on a list as probably subject to recapture.

Fourth. List of coal and steel roads making up the 42 per cent referred to by Commissioner Eastman.

Fifth. Amount of recapture due from each of these coal, steel, and larger carriers as compared with the amount due from small carriers.

Sixth. Amount of recapture each of the coal and steel roads has paid in.

Seventh. Statement of the dividends paid by each of these roads for each recapture year.

Eighth. Statement of net railway-operating income and net income for each of these roads for the last two years available.

Ninth. Statement of corporate surplus for each of these roads for the last two years available and for the beginning of the recapture period.

Tenth. Net railway-operating income of the roads in recapture.

Eleventh. List of railroads for which the commission furnished a statement of estimated recapture liability for the period 1920-1930, showing the corporate control either by other railroads or by any industry.

Twelfth. Excess cost of ties and rails which have been installed as replacements and have been charged to operating expenses.

The compiling of these data resulted in much information on the recapture phase, and Commissioner Eastman stated

that he furnished this to the committee at my request (pp. 344, 345, 347, hearings).

On February 3, 1932, I addressed a letter to Chairman RAYBURN, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, acquainting him with an itemized list of my requests from the commission to date. Later on I asked the commission for further material, some of which was not prepared until after the close of the hearings. This I am hereto appending (Exhibits I, II, and III). The commission, pursuant to my request relative to corporate control of these roads, furnished me all the information available; but this is too voluminous to be inserted in the *Record*, although it does not appear in the hearings.

These statistics which I called for show among other facts what these roads owe the Government, dividends paid to their stockholders, the amounts of their corporate surpluses, railway-operating revenues, and replacements charged to operating expenses. (Exhibits I, II, and III, and pp. 359-438; 556-568, hearings.) These figures prove that if recapture is repealed the money will go in most cases to rich roads, bankers, and large corporations—steel companies and Morgan and like interests.

Then I introduced a bill which to my mind would safeguard the public interest and would modify the existing law sufficiently to meet the needs of the present emergency. Certain of the short lines deserve sympathy. I do not include here those short lines that are affiliated with the big corporations—they are steadily making big profits year after year. I do not include either the "dead timber"—the 30,000 miles of "useless" and "socially wasteful" roads to which Mr. Lewis refers on page 531 of the hearings. These lines should be abandoned. If this were done the reputed 2 or 3 per cent aggregate earnings of our transportation system would be materially raised, for the inclusion of these useless roads pulls down the average. But there are other short lines vital to rural communities which the 3-year average would, in all fairness, protect.

To bring the loan fund within reach of weak roads, I propose that the interest rate be fluctuated so as to be comparable with securities of like character and also that the purposes for which the loan may be used be liberalized. That railroads may not be unduly forced to make recapture payments which would cripple them at a time of depression, I have provided for a "moratorium." But I propose that a law similar to our income tax law put "teeth" into the determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission of recapturable moneys and the immediate payment by railroads. Then, if there is adjustment to be made, it would come later, as in our income tax. Under such a law, after a few test cases this bugaboo of litigation would cease. Since the Supreme Court has ruled in *Smyth v. Ames* (169 U. S. 466) that value is "the basis of all calculations as to reasonableness of rates" and in *Dayton-Goose Creek v. United States*, (263 U. S. 456, pp. 479-480), that recapture is "the key provision of the plan" (meaning rate-making), I propose to leave our rate structure as it is with the single exception of providing that the percentage of value which would constitute a "fair return" thereon be specified annually by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In my bill, H. R. 9551, which I introduced on February 19, I have offered at least a constructive compromise measure which seems to me to meet the objections of 12 years' experience with the present law.

AN UNJUSTIFIABLE PROPOSITION

The unjustifiable iniquity of this whole measure is, however, the grant of \$360,000,000 to these special interests. They justify it on the plea that if you give it back to some, you must give it back to all. That is a strange kind of justice when the "all" have been declared by the Supreme Court to have no claims upon this fund and can not have, by any sort of title or property rights therein. The funds came from the people. Let us consider more in detail the enormity of this proposition. From the figures called for from the commission, the following summary is illuminating.

Class	Estimated liability	Per cent
I.....	\$336,443,378	93.08
II.....	15,929,742	4.41
III.....	2,259,036	.62
IV.....	6,833,659	1.89

Of the total recapture liability, 93 per cent, or three hundred and thirty-six millions, goes to the rich Class I roads.

From the tables furnished me by the commission it is to be observed that the total computed recapture liability for three roads alone—the Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, and the Duluth, Missabe & Northern—amounts to \$115,348,909. (Hearings, p. 556, Nos. 1, 2, and 3.) This, then, would be the amount of the gift we would make to these railroads.

The corporate surplus of the Chesapeake & Ohio in 1930 was \$175,629,633; dividend declared on its common stock in 1930 was 10 per cent. (Hearings, p. 387.) The corporate surplus of the Norfolk & Western in 1930 was \$202,140,584; its common stock paid dividends of 12 per cent. (Hearings, p. 404.) The Duluth, Missabe & Northern had a corporate surplus in 1930 of \$67,143,142 and its common-stock dividends were 100 per cent. (Hearings, p. 426.) Out of pity to these poor roads let us give them this dole!

Let us look at this proposed liberality from another point of view. Let us consider the \$10,000,000 that have actually been paid in. (Exhibit I.) Of this sum, over eight millions have been paid under protest by railroads controlled by industries, and the larger part by railroads controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and other iron and steel industries. (See Exhibit I and Eastman's testimony, hearings, p. 9.) Do the United States Steel Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation need this dole of \$8,000,000? Finally, let us consider the \$2,000,000, in round numbers, collected without protest. Just think, only \$1,893,703 out of \$360,000,000 have been paid into the Treasury without protest during the prosperous years 1920-1930. Poor Henry Ford paid in \$239,461.33 without protest.

What right have we to pay these steel roads and Henry Ford this \$10,000,000 or more?

We, Members of Congress, are assessing ourselves in this emergency an 11 per cent salary cut. This sum amounts annually to \$438,075. In four and one-half years of salary cut we will be able to make up only the \$1,893,703.62 paid in without protest. By cutting our mileage and stationery allowance we may be able to squeeze up to \$2,000,000. But what is that, if we can sacrifice and make the United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Henry Ford prosperous and happy?

I can not support H. R. 11677, and I hope the rule asked for will not be granted.

EXHIBIT I

Statement showing payments by carriers on account of excess net railway-operating income under paragraph 6 of section 15A of the interstate commerce act

PAYMENTS MADE UNDER PROTEST

Name of carrier	Excess income payment	Controlled by—
Bauxite & Northern Ry. Co.....	\$11,851.72	Aluminum Co. of America.
Bessemer & Lake Erie R. R. Co.....	442,280.00	United States Steel Corporation.
Birmingham Southern R. R. Co.....	31,371.43	Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.
Conemaugh & Blacklick Ry. Co.....	81,919.50	Bethlehem Steel.
Chattahoochee Valley Ry. Co.....	16,140.12	West Point Manufacturing Co.
Chicago & Illinois Midland Ry. Co.....	199,219.75	Commonwealth-Edison.
Chicago, West Pullman & Southern R. R. Co.....	5,035.68	International Harvester.
Cornwall R. R. Co.....	177,091.48	Bethlehem Steel.
Cowlitz, Chehalis & Cascade Ry.....	3,000.00	Admiralty Investment Co.
Durham & Southern Ry. Co.....	54,989.20	Duke interests.
Dayton Union Ry. Co.....	963.81	
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line R. R. Co.....	68,011.43	
Duluth, Missabe & Northern Ry. Co.....	5,808,256.61	U. S. Steel Corporation.
East Jersey R. R. & Terminal Co.....	3,332.61	Tidewater Oil.
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Ry. Co.....	55,147.23	U. S. Steel Corporation.
Genesee & Wyoming R. R. Co.....	480,107.60	International Salt Co.

Statement showing payments by carriers on account of excess net railway-operating income under paragraph 6 of section 15A of the interstate commerce act—Continued

PAYMENTS MADE UNDER PROTEST—continued

Name of carrier	Excess income payment	Controlled by—
Hannibal Connecting R. R. Co.....	\$17,532.49	Atlas Portland Cement Co.
Indiana Northern Ry. Co.....	2,942.92	Oliver Plow Works.
Ironton R. R. Co.....	574,639.16	Thomas Iron Co.
Johnstown & Stony Creek R. R. Co.....	1,162.49	Federal Steel.
Longview, Portland & Northern Ry. Co.....	5,310.43	Long-Bell Lumber Co.
La Salle & Bureau County R. R. Co.....	18,421.85	
Ligonier Valley R. R. Co.....	63,165.27	Mellon interests.
Lonsville, New Albany & Corydon R. R. Co.....	3,300.00	
Mount Hope Mineral R. R. Co.....	1,396.84	Warren Foundry Co.
Nevada Northern Ry. Co.....	39,729.26	Nevada Consolidated Copper.
Patapsco & Black Rivers R. R. Co.....	50,355.00	Bethlehem Steel.
Philadelphia, Bethlehem & New England R. R. Co.....	152,191.47	Do.
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac R. R. Co.....	194,919.88	
Rockport, Langdon & Northern Ry. Co.....	441.10	
San Luis Central R. R. Co.....	246.12	
St. Joseph Belt Ry. Co.....	2,624.76	Swift interests.
Santa Maria Valley R. R. Co.....	3,500.00	Santa Maria Oil Fields Co.
Tionesta Valley Ry. Co.....	20,944.42	Central Leather Co.
Toledo Terminal R. R. Co.....	18,337.07	
Warrenton R. R. Co.....	32,222.21	
Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout R. R. Co.....	55.19	
Lakeside & Marblehead R. R. Co.....	1271.94	Kelly Island Lime Co.
Sioux City Terminal Ry. Co.....	1455.78	Sioux City Stockyards.
Steeltown & Highspire R. R. Co.....	35,525.69	Bethlehem Steel.
Unity Railways Co.....	100,942.53	Union Collieries Co.
Total payments protested.....	8,785,382.00	

UNCONDITIONAL PAYMENTS

Ashley, Drew & Northern Ry. Co.....	\$5,811.11	
Atlantic & Carolina R. R. Co.....	364.57	
Augusta Northern Ry.....	5,070.80	
Augusta R. R. Co.....	47.83	
Bay Terminal R. R. Co.....	2,449.74	
Beaver, Meade & Englewood R. R. Co.....	1,431.45	
Brimstone Railroad & Canal Co.....	42,642.21	Union Sulphur Co.
Cambria & Indiana R. R. Co.....	18,630.46	J. H. Weaver.
Campbell's Creek R. R. Co.....	548.53	Campbell's Creek Coal Co.
Central Ry. Co. of Arkansas.....	2,004.44	Fort Smith Lumber Co.
Collins & Glennville R. R. Co.....	162.50	
Dayton-Goose Creek Ry. Co.....	183,127.38	
De Kalb & Western R. R. Co.....	10,025.47	
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton R. R. Co.....	239,461.63	Ford interests.
East Jordan & Southern R. R. Co.....	4,753.61	East Jordan Lumber Co.
Erie & Michigan Railway & Navigation Co.....	2,297.08	
Fordyce & Princeton R. R. Co.....	3,697.50	Crossett Land Co.
Fort Worth Belt Ry. Co.....	79,485.35	Armour & Swift.
Franklin & Abbeville Ry. Co.....	15,320.18	
Gideon & North Island R. R. Co.....	980.71	Gideon & Anderson Lumber Co.
Hutchinson & Northern Ry. Co.....	154.25	Carey interests.
Illinois Terminal R. R. Co.....	800,000.00	Illinois Power & Light.
Indian Creek Valley Ry. Co.....	3,852.92	
Jonesboro, Lake City & Eastern R. R. Co.....	42,450.00	
Kanawha, Glen Jean & Eastern R. R. Co.....	5,460.88	McKell interests.
Kinston Carolina R. R. Co.....	62.91	
Lakeside & Marblehead R. R. Co.....	5,206.51	Kelly Island Lime Co.
Lancaster & Chester Ry. Co.....	14,760.90	Spring Mills Co.
Laurinburg & Southern R. R. Co.....	2,518.23	
Louisiana & Arkansas Ry. Co.....	8,000.02	
Louisiana & Mississippi R. R. & Transportation Co.....	20.03	
Ludington & Northern Ry.....	2,865.56	Stearns Salt Co.
Middletown & Unionville R. R. Co.....	51.71	
Missouri & Illinois Bridge & Belt R. R. Co.....	3,026.82	
Mount Hood R. R. Co.....	7,359.83	
Natchez, Urania & Ruston Ry. Co.....	530.95	Urania Lumber Co.
Neame, Carson & Southern R. R. Co.....	2,120.41	Delta Land Co.
New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Ry. Co.....	5,248.35	
Pittsburgh, Lisbon & Western R. R. Co.....	3,818.57	Pittsburgh Coal Co.
Port Huron & Detroit R. R. Co.....	195,090.87	
Potato Creek R. R. Co.....	1,005.81	
South San Francisco Belt Ry.....	1,374.54	San Francisco Land Co.
San Joaquin & Eastern R. R. Co.....	12,539.03	South California Edison Co.
San Antonio Southern Ry. Co.....	2,460.86	
Shreveport, Houston & Gulf R. R. Co.....	1,674.27	
Sioux City Terminal Ry. Co.....	4,893.81	Sioux City Stockyards.
South Buffalo Ry. Co.....	23,768.50	Bethlehem Steel.
Steeltown & Highspire R. R. Co.....	7,410.21	Do.
Sugar Land Ry. Co.....	27,435.67	
Talbotton R. R. Co.....	36.56	Persons Bros.
Trinity Valley Southern R. R. Co.....	102.37	
Tuckerton R. R. Co.....	1,949.68	
Tucson, Cornelia & Gila Bend R. R. Co.....	11,967.34	Douglas Copper Co.
Tuskegee R. R. Co.....	2,480.90	
Unity Railways Co.....	40,907.06	Union Collieries Co.
Upper Merion & Plymouth R. R. Co.....	2,384.58	Wood, Iron & Steel Co.
Warren & Ouchita Valley Ry. Co.....	14,444.45	Arkansas Lumber Co.

Statement showing payments by carriers, etc.—Continued
UNCONDITIONAL PAYMENTS—continued

Name of carrier	Excess income payment	Controlled by—
Washington Run R. R. Co.	\$6,744.83	Washington Coal & Coka
Wichita Falls & Southern Ry. Co.	369.71	
Wyandotte Terminal R. R. Co.	8,241.17	Michigan Alkali Co.
Total unconditional payments	1,893,703.62	
RECAPITULATION		
Payments made under protest		\$8,785,382.00
Unconditional payments		1,893,703.62
Total payments		10,679,085.62
‡\$5,205.51 not protested.	‡\$271.94 under protest.	
‡\$4,893.81 not protested.	‡\$55.78 under protest.	
‡\$7,410.21 not protested.	‡\$35,525.69 under protest.	
‡\$40,907.06 not protested.	‡\$100,942.53 under protest.	

EXHIBIT II

RAILWAY-OPERATING REVENUES

Class I roads, 1920-1930

(Compiled from statistics of Interstate Commerce Commission showing operating revenues and operating expenses of Class I steam railways in the United States)

1920	\$6,225,417,245
1921	5,573,153,133
1922	5,620,401,722
1923	6,360,423,213
1924	5,987,662,226
1925	6,186,603,519
1926	6,465,295,348
1927	6,210,029,787
1928	6,189,917,189
1929	6,360,303,775
1930	5,343,665,634
	66,502,872,791

EXHIBIT III

Statement of cost of existing property charged to operating expenses, from date of basic valuation to date indicated, under straight renewal accounting as developed in connection with recapture reports that have been served on carriers

Name of road	End of period covered (Dec. 31, unless otherwise noted)	Additional cost charged to operating expenses for straight renewals	Additional cost charged to operating expenses for hardwood and/or treated ties replacing softwood and untreated ties	Total additional cost charged to operating expenses
Abilene & Southern Ry. Co.	1926	\$75,593	\$1,609	\$77,202
Alabama & Northwestern R. R. Co.	1927	18,278		18,278
Alton & Eastern R. R. Co.	1927	17,638	11,655	29,293
Alton & Southern R. R.	1926	30,598	46,338	76,936
Arkansas & Louisiana Midland Ry. Co.	1925	9,475		9,475
Ashley, Drew & Northern Ry. Co.	1927	25,628		25,628
Augusta Northern Ry.	1927	13,386		13,386
Batesville Southwestern R. R.	1921	777		777
Bath & Hammondsport R. R. Co.	1920			(1)
Bauxite & Northern Ry. Co.	1926	3,785	669	4,454
Bessemer & Lake Erie R. R. Co.	1927	712,952	81,474	794,426
Birmingham & Southeastern Ry. Co.	1926	96,480	14,179	110,659
Blytheville, Leachville & Arkansas Southern R. R. Co.	1923	14,768		14,768
Brimstone Railroad & Canal Co.	1928	5,989	3,787	9,776
Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal	1927	7,110	1,198	8,308
Canton R. R. Co.	1926			(1)
Carolina & Northeastern R. R. Co.	1925	3,805		3,805
Cement, Tolamas & Tidewater R. R. Co.	1924	4,663	620	5,283
Central Ry. Co. of Arkansas	1926	13,857		13,857
Central West Virginia & Southern R. R. Co.	1927	30,308		30,308
The Charters Southern Ry. Co.	1926			(1)
Chattahoochee Valley Ry. Co.	1925	111,883		111,883
Chicago & Illinois Western R. R.	1927	14,474	4,049	18,523
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer R. R. Co.	1927	14,067	10,491	24,558
Chicago Short Line Ry. Co.	1927	5,739	4,603	10,342
Chicago, West Pullman & Southern R. R. Co.	1926	18,373	4,075	22,448
Collins & Glennville R. R. Co.	1927	8,897		8,897
Cornwall R. R. Co.	1925	38,186		38,186
Cuyahoga Valley Ry. Co.	1927	33,371		33,371
Dayton-Goose Creek Ry. Co.	1926	53,727		53,727
East Jordan & Southern R. R. Co.	1927	12,864		12,864
Erie & Michigan Railway & Navigation Co.	1926	1,055		1,055
Etna & Montrose R. R. Co.	1926	5,707		5,707
Fort Worth Belt Ry. Co.	1927	60,093		60,093
Franklin & Abbeville Ry. Co.	1922	5,340	9,523	14,868
French Broad R. R. Co.	1924	3,224		3,224
Genesee & Wyoming R. R. Co.	1927	47,087		47,087
Georgia Southwestern & Gulf R. R. Co.	1925	24,665		24,665
Gladys & Alpena R. R. Co.	1922	1,341		1,341
Great Northern Ry. Co.	1927	80,585		80,585
Hannibal Connecting R. R. Co.	1925	13,415		13,415
Illinois Northern Ry.	1926	37,193	3,171	40,364
Indian Creek Valley Ry. Co.	1924	27,039		27,039
Interstate R. R. Co.	1927	352,045		352,045
Ironton R. R. Co.	1924	35,644		35,644
Jackson & Eastern Ry. Co.	1925	340		340
Johnstown & Stony Creek R. R. Co.	1922	2,293		2,293
Jonesboro, Lake City & Eastern R. R. Co.	1925			(1)
Kellys Creek & Northwestern R. R. Co.	1927	6,815		6,815
Kosciusko & South Eastern R. R. Co.	1927	7,013		7,013
Lake Erie, Franklin & Clarion R. R. Co.	1927	33,305		33,305
Lakeside & Marblehead R. R. Co.	1923	37,125	877	38,002
Lake Terminal R. R. Co.	1922	24,102		24,102
Lancaster & Chester Ry. Co.	1927	26,851		26,851
La Salle & Bureau County R. R. Co.	1927	13,799	2,561	16,360
Laurinburg & Southern R. R. Co.	1927	26,113		26,113
Ligonier Valley R. R. Co.	1922	35,484		35,484
Live Oak, Perry & Gulf R. R. Co.	1926	68,127		68,127
Louisiana & Northwest R. R. Co.	1927	41,666		41,666
Louisiana Southern Ry. Co.	1926	44,632	4,607	49,239
Louisville, New Albany & Corydon R. R. Co.	1927	4,539		4,539
Ludington & Northern Ry.	1927	8,514		8,514
Mansfield Railway & Transportation Co.	1925	3,318		3,318
Middletown & Unionville R. R. Co.	1927	4,890	112	5,002
Minneapolis, Northfield & Southern Ry.	1927	23,544	37,681	61,225
Mississippi River & Bonne Terre Ry.	1927	80,692		80,692
Montana, Wyoming & Southern R. R. Co.	1927	35,918		35,918
Moscow, Camden & San Augustine Ry. Co.	1927	-4,719		-4,719
Mount Hood R. R. Co.	1926	19,885		19,885

Statement of cost of existing property charged to operating expenses, from date of basic valuation to date indicated, under straight renewal accounting as developed in connection with recapture reports that have been served on carriers—Continued

Name of road	End of period covered (Dec. 31, unless otherwise noted)	Additional cost charged to operating expenses for straight renewals	Additional cost charged to operating expenses for hardwood and/or treated ties replacing softwood and untreated ties	Total additional cost charged to operating expenses
Mount Hope Mineral R. R. Co.	1927	\$4,178	\$3,347	\$7,525
Nacogdoches & Southeastern R. R. Co.	1927	39,329		39,329
Newark Valley R. R. Co.	1927	10,460		10,460
Norfolk & Portsmouth Belt Line R. R. Co.	1923	75,534	25	75,559
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.	1926	8,884,575	2,801,324	11,685,899
Northampton & Bath R. R. Co.	1927	19,510	911	20,421
Oil Fields Short Line R. R. Co.	1923			(1)
Oklahoma, New Mexico & Pacific Ry. Co.	1923	41,692		41,692
Okmulgee Northern Ry. Co.	1927	15,589		15,589
Pere Marquette Ry. Co.	1925	4,211,845	796,688	5,008,533
Pittsburg & Shawmut R. R. Co.	1923	127,128	7,650	134,778
Port Huron & Detroit R. R. Co.	1927	2,085	16,604	18,689
Potato Creek R. R. Co.	1927			(1)
Prescott & Northwestern R. R. Co.	1925	18,600		18,600
Reynoldsville & Falls Creek R. R. Co.	1927	6,234		6,234
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac R. R. Co.	1927	906,577		906,577
Roanoke Ry. Co.	1923			(1)
Rockcastle River Ry. Co.	1929	16,388		16,388
Salem, Winona & Southern R. R. Co.	1928			(1)
San Luis Central R. R. Co.	1927	7,805		7,805
Santa Maria Valley R. R. Co.	1920	4,995		4,995
Siiverton Northern R. R. Co.	1926	2,828		2,828
Smoky Mountain Ry. Co.	1927	6,687		6,687
Sugar Land Ry. Co.	1925	65,436	2,278	67,714
Toledo, Angola & Western Ry. Co.	1927	13,259	5,539	18,798
Tuckerton R. R. Co.	1927	24,094		24,094
Tucson, Cornelia & Gila Bend R. R. Co.	1927	9,097		9,097
Tuskegee R. R. Co.	1927	15,234		15,234
Union Freight R. R. Co.	1925			(1)
Unity Railways Co.	1927	8,935		8,935
Utah Ry. Co.	1923	47,830	16,901	64,731
Warrenton R. R. Co.	1927	2,548	19	2,567
Washington Run R. R. Co.	1929	14,531		14,531
Wharton & Northern R. R. Co.	1923	8,914		8,914
Wildwood & Delaware Bay Short Line R. R. Co.	1926	5,218	1,086	6,304
Wyandotte Terminal R. R. Co.	1927	12,813		12,813
Yosemite Valley R. R. Co.	1925	58,397		58,397
Youngstown & Northern R. R. Co.	1927	29,813		29,813
Total		17,319,618	3,895,656	21,215,274

¹ Inconsequential.

² Apr. 30.

³ Aug. 10.

⁴ Oct. 31.

⁵ Oct. 1.

⁶ Jan. 28.

ADMIRAL FREDERICK C. BILLARD

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks touching the life, character, and public service of the late Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Admiral Frederick C. Billard, whose death occurred in this city on the 17th of this month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I deem it appropriate to make this formal reference to the life, character, and public service of one of the Nation's most popular and capable officials, Rear Admiral Frederick Chamberlayne Billard, who died in the city of Washington on the 17th of this month.

During the nine years I have been in the House of Representatives I have served as a member of the Appropriations Committee and of the Treasury-Post Office Departments subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Because of my membership and work on this subcommittee I was thrown into official relationship with Admiral Billard throughout this period. Annually he came before the subcommittee at its hearings on the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill and, with his staff, presented the justifications for the various appropriation items carried therein.

Through this contact I became very much interested in the Coast Guard Service and learned in this first-hand way of its outstanding achievements. Thus, also, I have been able to judge as to the character of work performed by Admiral Billard since he has been Commandant of the Coast Guard, since 1924. His record in that capacity, in my judgment, has never been excelled by any predecessor, and perhaps never equaled.

Admiral Billard was born in the District of Columbia on September 22, 1873, the son of Dr. Jules Frederick and Lillian (Johnson) Billard. He attended Baltimore City College,

from which institution he graduated in 1892. Having successfully passed the examination for entrance into the then Revenue Cutter Service, he was appointed a cadet from Maryland on January 11, 1894. He thereupon received a large portion of his cadet training on board the old practice ship *Chase*, and graduated second in his class. He was commissioned an ensign on April 27, 1896, and passed through the various grades of the Coast Guard Service until he reached the post of commandant, having been appointed thereto on January 11, 1924, with the rank of rear admiral, exactly 30 years after receiving his appointment as cadet. On January 11, 1928, he was reappointed commandant for another 4-year term, and was again reappointed for another like term on January 11, 1932. Three appointments to the chief station or office in the Coast Guard Service was, and is, without a precedent. At the time of his death he had been connected with that service more than 38 years.

Admiral Billard during his long and responsible career in the Coast Guard served on all the coasts of the United States, as well as in Alaskan, Hawaiian, and West Indian waters. During the Spanish-American War he served on the U. S. S. *Corwin*, attached to the Pacific Fleet. From 1900 to 1905 he was navigator and instructor on the practice ship *Chase*. From 1906 to 1911 he was aide to Capt. Worth G. Ross, Chief of the Revenue Cutter Service. In 1914 he was appointed as superintendent of the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., serving in that capacity from 1914 to 1918. Thereupon, at his request to serve afloat, he was placed in command of the U. S. S. *Aphrodite*, operating in the European war zone during the World War. This ship was the first American war vessel to pass through the Kiel Canal after the signing of the armistice. He was awarded the Navy cross for service in European waters. In May, 1919, he returned from Europe, and in September of

that year was detailed as aide to the Commandant of the Coast Guard, serving in that capacity until appointed commandant on January 11, 1924, for his first 4-year term.

Hence, Admiral Billard, at the time of his death, was serving his ninth year as Commandant of the Coast Guard.

In 1920 he married Miss Clara F. Prentiss, of New London, Conn., who, as well as his three brothers and a sister, survive him.

HISTORY AND CHARACTER OF THE COAST GUARD SERVICE

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to speak in terms of extended praise touching the invaluable services the United States Coast Guard has rendered through all the years of our national history. It is one of the Nation's oldest activities, having been established in 1790, during the first Congress in the first administration of President Washington. A paramount duty of the Coast Guard is the protection of life and property from the perils of the sea; and it was a matter of great pride and gratification with Admiral Billard that this phase of Coast Guard work has been marked by a record of achievement which stands above that of any other life-saving organization in the world. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931, the Coast Guard rescued from danger, or saved, the lives of 5,627 persons, and the value of vessels assisted, together with their cargoes, aggregated \$47,959,465.

The work of the Coast Guard is varied in an unusual degree. In addition to its life-saving work, another outstanding activity which has always claimed its attention is the prevention of smuggling of every character. In recent years this phase of service has extended to the highly perilous and difficult work of preventing the entry into the United States of contraband liquors prohibited by Federal law.

All these activities, during his service as commandant, were supervised and directed by Admiral Billard; and the noteworthy character of his service was attested by his reappointments as commandant. Within the period of this supervision and direction Coast Guard problems assumed a greater magnitude and importance than ever before. This service has always had its ideals and traditions, similar to those which have always inspired our Army and Navy forces; and, like the Army and Navy, the Coast Guard in remaining true to its traditions and ideals has ever preserved its superb morale and maintained its high standard of achievement.

CHARACTER AND CHARACTERISTICS

Quiet and modest sailor though he was, Admiral Billard nevertheless possessed a rugged force of character. He knew how to obey and how to command. His professional and executive abilities were of the highest order; and it was inevitable that he should rise to chief command in the Coast Guard. His strong, genial, and sympathetic character invited and impelled friendship. Officers and men throughout the service loved and were loyal to him. His discipline was of a character wise and efficient, rather than stern or arbitrary. Under his administration the service rose, perhaps, to the highest point of effective achievement attained in all its history.

In the discharge of his important duties Admiral Billard literally wore himself out. One of the latest tasks which came to him—and one which singularly appealed to his ardent and sympathetic nature—was that of supervising the search by the Coast Guard fleet in the Atlantic waters to find the Lindbergh baby and the dastardly kidnapers that have written into American history one of its most tragic and sinister pages.

A little more than 58 years of age at his death, his life would doubtless have been substantially lengthened except for the overwhelming burdens which he undertook to bear. In all truth, he spent himself for the public good. And now, having achieved so much and gone at length to his final reward, he deserves and will receive the enduring gratitude of the Nation he loved so well and whose interests he so faithfully and effectively served.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT TRIBUTE

The Coast Guard, in peace times, is an activity of the Treasury Department (but in time of war it operates as a

part of the Navy). In consequence, a period of mourning for Admiral Billard, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Ogden L. Mills, has been directed for a period of 15 days, beginning May 18. During that time all ships and stations of the Coast Guard are directed to display half-mast colors, and all officers to wear official mourning. In addition, the Secretary addressed to the Coast Guard a tribute to Admiral Billard, in the following language:

In the passing of your beloved Commandant, I wish to pay the highest tribute to his noble character and unselfish and devoted service to the Coast Guard and Nation, which he has served continuously since 1894. Since 1924, he has been Commandant of the Coast Guard during its period of greatest expansion and development of its highest efficiency. He was not only a seaman in every sense of the word, but was an executive of the highest order. Through his death the country loses an invaluable public servant.

AN IRREPARABLE LOSS

Mr. Speaker, I know that the many friends of Admiral Billard, in both branches of Congress, who, during the years of his service as Commandant of the Coast Guard, like myself, have been thrown into intimate contact with him, and have come to appreciate his splendid character and service, feel as I do, that in his death, the Nation which he so long and honorably served, has sustained an irreparable loss. All these, too, I am sure, join with me in giving expression to sentiments of the most earnest sympathy for his devoted and sorrowing helpmate, and the others of his family, because of the great bereavement which has come to them.

And now, in hallowed Arlington, the Nation's Valhalla, the dust of our beloved friend shall sleep through the years to come, while his knightly spirit shall go marching on; and so long as our flag may grace the sky the memory of his life and deeds shall constitute an inspiration of the noblest character to those who shall follow after him in the service in which he so long and so splendidly wrought.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 20, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, May 20, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

Hearings, Mansfield bond issue bill for rivers and harbors.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Hearings, emergency officers.

INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Samoa Islands.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings, World Court.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1153. An act to provide for the incorporation of credit unions within the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 3711. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the Chelan National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9557. A bill to amend certain sections of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, relating to descent and distribution; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 227. A resolution to authorize public inspection of pay-roll records of the disbursing officer of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12115. A bill to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 229. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 12094, a bill to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to codify and amend common-law rights of authors in their writings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. J. Res. 41. A joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission and specifying the powers and duties thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8013. A bill to amend the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia creating the office of steam-boiler inspector for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11638. A bill to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11642. A bill to amend sections 15a and 19a of the interstate commerce act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11643. A bill to amend section 5 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, relating to the consolidation and acquisition of control of carriers by railroad, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EATON of Colorado: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11895. A bill to authorize the President, in his discretion, to make certain adjustments in the eastern boundary line of Rocky Mountain National Park in the vicinity of Estes Park, Colo., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Jennie Bruce Gallahan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 12170) to provide that the workmen's compensation law of any State may apply, within such State, to employments in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 12171) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12172) to authorize the acquisition of land for a mail service airport in the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 12173) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 12174) to authorize the use of Minnesota Chippewa tribal funds to purchase certain land as wild rice harvesting camp site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 12175) to grant allowances for quarters and subsistence to retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps while in Army or Navy hospitals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H. Res. 229) for the consideration of H. R. 12094, a bill to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to codify and amend common-law rights of authors in their writings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAYBURN: Resolution (H. Res. 230) for the consideration of H. R. 11642, a bill to amend sections 15a and 19a of the interstate commerce act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 231) for the consideration of H. R. 11643, a bill to amend section 5 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, relating to the consolidation and acquisition of control of carriers by railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) to promote patriotism by providing that all officers and employees of the United States and the District of Columbia shall know the national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PRATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 393) relating to publications for the blind; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 394) providing for financing sales of wheat and cotton in foreign markets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 395) to repeal the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRISP: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) extending for one year the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under settlement of war claims act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and of the Tripartite Claims Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 397) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 12176) for the relief of Maj. Clarence H. Greene, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 12177) granting an increase of pension to Lillie E. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12178) granting an increase of pension to Alma E. Lacock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 12179) for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 12180) for the relief of John J. Coyne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 12181) for the relief of Hjalmar Krogh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 12182) granting an increase of pension to Laura D. Spangler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12183) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a congressional medal of honor to Col. Oliver P. M. Hazzard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 12184) for the relief of Russell O'Neill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12185) for the relief of R. H. Keene; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12186) granting a pension to Marie Weed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12187) for the relief of H. B. Arnold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12188) conferring jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Gates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 12189) granting an increase of pension to Mintie Martz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12190) for the relief of the legal representatives of the late Alvina Schallhorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12191) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gallacher Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 12192) for the relief of John H. Morse; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12193) for the relief of John P. Seabrook; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 12194) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Jane Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12195) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Cowgill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7814. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of Patterson and Patterson Colony, Stanislaus County, Calif., relative to reducing Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Economy.

7815. Also, petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, who are borrowers from the Federal land bank, urging the amendment of the Federal farm loan act to provide extensions of time for maturity of loans, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7816. By Mr. BEAM: Memorial of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., memorializing Congress to authorize immediately a Federal bond issue of sufficient amount to finance public improvements for the purpose of starting the wheels of industry and relieving unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7817. By Mr. BOLAND: Petition of Charles Dorrance, of Scranton, Pa., and some 55,000 other citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring a protective tariff against the free importation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7818. By Mr. COYLE: Petition of Charles Dorrance, of Scranton, Pa., and some 55,000 other citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring a protective tariff against the free importation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7819. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Alhambra, Calif., petitioning Con-

gress for the immediate working out of a balanced Budget with only such increase in taxes as may be necessary, coupled with the most stringent economy in governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7820. Also, petition of board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Alhambra, Calif., requesting Congress to enact legislation to regulate hauling by trucks and busses so as to protect the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7821. Also, petition of Mary Flynn and many other residents of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning Congress to legalize and tax beer to help balance the Budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7822. By Mr. KELLER: Resolution of the city of Chicago, passed by the city council thereof, petitioning the Congress to pass a \$5,000,000,000 bond issue to put men to work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7823. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Eppinger & Russell Co., creosoting works, New York City, urging reduction in governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Economy.

7824. Also, petition of Daniel Maltby Rugg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging reduction of Government expenditures; to the Committee on Economy.

7825. Also, petition of St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1525 and House bill 4537; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7826. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of W. A. Davis and 228 other citizens and voters of Savannah, Ga., urging the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7827. Also, petition of H. L. Scott, of Savannah, and 11 other citizens of Savannah and Atlanta, Ga., urging the passage of railroad pension bill, H. R. 9891, and voicing opposition to Senate bill 3892 and House bill 10023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7828. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Henry C. Hawes and 30 citizens of Chicago, Ill., and vicinity, favoring House bill 6182; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7829. Also, resolution of the Sangamon Post, No. 32, of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, Springfield, Ill., objecting to reductions in the appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7830. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Chapter No. 140, Associated Master Barbers of America, St. Louis, Mo., and Local No. 102, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, St. Louis, Mo., pertaining to pending legislation; to the Committee on Economy.

7831. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Jamaica National Bank, Jamaica, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 4550; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7832. Also, petition of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the immediate enactment of Senate bill 1525 and House bill 4537, relative to kidnaping; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7833. Also, petition of the Gardner W. Taylor Lumber Co., New York City, protesting against the proposed duty on Canadian lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7834. By Mr. SHOTT: Letter from the Kipling Shoe Co., of Huntington, W. Va., protesting against the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7835. Also, memorial of the Huntington Manufacturers Club, of Huntington, W. Va., protesting against the present cost of government, and urging reductions in bureau costs and general expenditures in Government departments; to the Committee on Economy.

7836. Also, resolution of the Williamson Chamber of Commerce, Williamson, W. Va., protesting against the Romjue bill, H. R. 8576, and the Oddie bill, S. 4080; to the Committee on Labor.

7837. Also, letter and resolution of the Bluefield Better Service Club, Bluefield, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous coal industry the passage of the Davis-Kelly

coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7838. Also, resolution of citizens and taxpayers of Waiteville, Monroe County, W. Va., opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7839. Also, letter signed by J. H. Randolph, general manager of the Imperial Ice Cream Co., of Parkersburg, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal regulation bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7840. Also, letter from H. A. Gallagher, general manager of the Milburn By-Products Coal Co., and resolution of the Milburn Safety Club, Milburn, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7841. Also, letter from Luther O. Griffith, Griffith Lumber Co., of Huntington, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly coal bill as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7842. Also, letter from the executive vice president of the First Huntington National Bank Building, Huntington, W. Va., protesting against the passage of the legislation known as the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7843. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Fayetteville District Political and Civic Club, of Fayetteville, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7844. By Mr. STEWART: Resolution of the Morristown Chamber of Commerce, Morristown, N. J., favoring economy legislation, the balancing of the Budget, and approving the action of the Committee on Ways and Means in reporting adversely the bills providing for the payment of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1932

(Legislative day of Monday, May 9, 1932)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Hull	Reed
Bankhead	Davis	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Barbour	Dickinson	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Dill	Kean	Sheppard
Bingham	Fess	Kendrick	Shortridge
Blaine	Fletcher	Keyes	Smith
Borah	Frazier	La Follette	Smoot
Bratton	George	Lewis	Stephens
Brookhart	Glenn	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkeley	Goldsborough	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gore	McGill	Townsend
Capper	Hale	McNary	Trammell
Caraway	Harrison	Moses	Tydings
Cohen	Hastings	Neely	Vandenberg
Connally	Hatfield	Norris	Wagner
Coolidge	Hayden	Nye	Watson
Copeland	Hebert	Oddie	White
Costigan	Howell	Pittman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The Chair also desires to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] are detained in committee meeting and that the following-named Senators are detained in the meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency: The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. HULL. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is necessarily detained from the Senate by serious illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. ASHURST presented memorials of sundry citizens of Phoenix and Tucson, Ariz., remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on the automobile industry, and favoring instead some form of general sales tax to be included in the pending revenue bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY presented resolutions adopted by the voters' committee, Blum, Tex., opposing economy in veterans' legislation and the issuance of bonds or the imposition of taxation for relief purposes, and favoring the issuance of new currency for all relief measures, such relief to be "in the form of jobs and not charity," which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions adopted by the Men's Bible Class of the First Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md., favoring the adoption of measures to bring about the apprehension and punishment of the Lindbergh baby kidnapers and murderers, and also such measures as will prevent the repetition of crimes of this nature, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on the automobile industry, and favoring the raising of revenue by some form of general taxation, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Nellie S. Watson, registered nurse, and several other doctors and nurses of Tacoma Park, Md., praying for the passage of legislation providing for the dissemination of contraceptive information (birth control), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARBOUR presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on the automobile industry, and favoring some form of general tax be included in lieu thereof in the pending revenue bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of the Sons of American Revolution in congress assembled, remonstrating against any further reductions in the strength of the Regular Army or any curtailment in the training of citizen components of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Morristown (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the immediate passage of legislation effecting economy and retrenchment in Federal expenditures, and opposing the adoption of so-called bonus proposals at the present time, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Hammonton in the Chamber of Commerce of Newark, in the State of New Jersey, favoring the balancing of the Budget as far as possible by retrenchment in governmental expenditures rather than increased taxes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented letters in the nature of petitions from 300 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of legislation to balance the Budget, and also for the support of the President's economy program, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from 325 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retrenchment in governmental expenditures and the balancing of the Budget through taxation on some such basis as is offered by a general sales tax, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.